

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1348509

BR
45
T43
v.3
no.3



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

TEXTS AND STUDIES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO
BIBLICAL AND PATRISTIC LITERATURE

EDITED BY

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON B.D.

HON. PH.D. GÖTTINGEN HON. D.D. HALLE
NORRISIAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY

VOL. III. No. 3.

EUTHALIANA

BY

THE EDITOR

CAMBRIDGE

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS' WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA

✓ TEXTS AND STUDIES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO
BIBLICAL AND PATRISTIC LITERATURE

EDITED BY

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON B.D.

HON. PH.D. GÖTTINGEN HON. D.D. HALLE
NORRISIAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY

VOL. III.

No. 3. EUTHALIANA

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1895

London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.

Glasgow: 263 ARGYLE STREET.



Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.
New York: MACMILLAN AND CO.

BR
45
T43
V.3
no.3
" EUTHALIANA

STUDIES OF EUTHALIUS
CODEX H OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES
AND THE ARMENIAN VERSION

WITH AN APPENDIX
CONTAINING A COLLATION OF THE ETON MS
OF THE PSEUDO-ATHANASIAN SYNOPSIS

BY

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON B.D.
^{HON.} PH.D. GÖTTINGEN HON. D.D. HALLE
NORRISIAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1895.

[All Rights reserved]

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

26-19421

Cambridge:

PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PREFACE.

THE problem of the classification of the cursive MSS of the New Testament is one which promises to baffle the textual critic for a long time to come. A vast amount of preliminary work must be done in the collation of texts of which our knowledge is at present lamentably defective. A mere list of variants from a particular standard is not enough by itself to illuminate the history of a MS. We require to know—and we are very seldom told—what subsidiary matter has found its way into a codex, in the form either of prefatory notices or of marginal apparatus. MSS of the Acts and the Epistles, for example, are seldom without some of these embellishments. They are to a large extent descended ultimately from an edition of these books put out in ancient times by a modest scholar who has not revealed his own personality, but to whom tradition has ascribed the name of Euthalius. A knowledge of the history of the Euthalian apparatus must furnish an important clue to those who would undertake the task to which we have referred. A laborious effort has recently been made by a German scholar to reduce to order some portions of the chaos¹. But he has attempted to conjure with the name of Euthalius without a knowledge of the risks he ran.

“We have only to mention the name of Euthalius,” says Dr Zahn², and his words have been more than once quoted of late, “in order to call up a multitude of unanswered questions.” Some

¹ Bousset, *Textkritische Studien* (Leipzig 1894). If I have spoken somewhat severely of this book, it is not because I do not recognise the ability and zeal of its author, but because the subject is one in which inaccurate statements are peculiarly misleading.

² *Geschichte des NTlichen Kanons*, II. 384.

of these questions I have endeavoured to deal with in the present Essay. The answers to several of them are still to seek: but I trust that I have done something to clear away some general misapprehensions both as to the date of Euthalius and as to the scope of his work. I do not in the least pretend to an exhaustive treatment. My object has rather been to pave the way for an edition of the Euthalian materials, a task to which I hope some scholar will address himself.

One of the collateral pleasures that belong to work upon a topic like the present, which, however obscure it may be, lies in the heart of the region of Textual Criticism, is that the study of one problem often throws unsuspected light upon other problems, or at any rate involves investigations which, though their results may be only negative as regards the particular question which called them forth, yet seldom fail to bring a reward of their own.

Thus it happens that on the present occasion I have something to say on several topics of first-rate interest to students of the New Testament text.

(1) The birthplace and the early home of the two great Uncials **A** and **B** is a matter of keen controversy. I believe that I have called attention to a fact which will have to be reckoned with in this connexion.

(2) My researches naturally led me to a fresh examination of the fragments of Codex H of the Pauline Epistles, and I am fortunately able to present to the Biblical critic almost the whole text of sixteen pages which are still missing from that important Uncial. Before their disappearance they had left their mark upon their companion pages in a faint yellow stain which has yielded up its precious secret to a patient effort at decipherment. I cannot sufficiently express my gratitude to the Reverend H. S. Cronin, Dean of Trinity Hall, who has set aside important work of his own to spend much time and eyesight upon the revision of my transcript.

(3) In quite another direction Euthalius has challenged me to speak, when otherwise I should have kept silence for the present. My very inadequate knowledge of the Armenian language would have prevented me from expressing a judgment on so serious a question as the origin of the Armenian Version,

had not a theory which connected a portion of that Version with the Edition of Euthalius claimed to be investigated in any discussion of Euthalian problems. I believe that the result of this investigation reaches beyond its immediate purpose, and will be found to have an important bearing on the textual criticism of the Gospels as well.

(4) I have added in an Appendix a collation of the unique MS of the Pseudo-Athanasiian Synopsis which has been missing since the days of Montfaucon, and has recently been found again by Dr James in the library of Eton College. As portions of this Synopsis are frequently interpolated into the Euthalian apparatus, the present seemed a fitting opportunity for making known the results of this discovery. I am indebted to the Provost and Fellows of Eton College for allowing the MS to lie at my disposal in the Fitzwilliam Museum.

Among those to whom I am under a further obligation of gratitude are Mr F. C. Burkitt and Mr E. J. Robson, Scholar of this College, who have kindly assisted me in the correction of my proof-sheets.

CHRIST'S COLLEGE,

July, 1895.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGES
I. RECENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DISCUSSION OF THE EUTHALIAN PROBLEM	1-10
Summary of Zacagni's Investigations	1
Henri Omont's edition of H ^{Paul}	2
Albert Ehrhard	5
Ernst von Dobschütz	7
J. Rendel Harris	7
F. C. Conybeare	8
II. THE WORK DONE BY EUTHALIUS	11-27
His own description of it	11
Examination of Zacagni's Materials	
The Tables of Lections	14
The Short Tables of Quotations	17
The Full Tables of Quotations	18
The Pseudo-Athanasiian Summaries	20
The Tables of Chapter Summaries	20
Further Interpolations	26
Critical Results of this Examination	27
III. THE DATE OF EUTHALIUS, AND TRACES OF HIS INFLUENCE	28-47
The Martyrium Pauli	28
Other indications of date	
Athanasius or Meletius ?	31
The Library at Caesarea	34
Chapters of the Acts in A and B	36
The Locality of Euthalius	43
IV. NOTES ON CODEX H OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES	48-71
Recovery of the text of some pages now lost	48
Notes on M. Omont's transcript of H	66
The relation of H to the Euthalian Edition	69

	PAGES
V. THE ARMENIAN VERSION AND ITS SUPPOSED RELATION TO EUTHALIUS	72-98
The origin of the Armenian Version of the N. T.	72
The Armenian Version of the Gospels	76
The Armenian Version of the Pauline Epistles	83
The Armenian Version and the 'Euthalian Text'	92
VI. SUMMARY OF RESULTS	99-104
APPENDIX	
Collation of the Pseudo-Athanasiian Synopsis	105-120

EUTHALIANA.

CHAPTER I.

RECENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DISCUSSION OF THE EUTHALIAN PROBLEM.

THE personality and the date of Euthalius have long been a matter of controversy. The indispensable memoir on the subject is that of Zacagni in his *Collectanea Monumentorum Veterum*, published at Rome in 1698. This work was partially reprinted by Galland (Ven. 1774, tom. x), and afterwards, yet more incompletely, by Migne in the *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 85: but no student of the subject can afford to be without the original memoir, which alone contains Zacagni's important Introduction.

1. Zacagni edited in full for the first time a vast mass of prologues, *argumenta*, *programmata*, lists of O. T. citations, lists of chapters, colophons and scraps of all kinds, which he gathered out of Euthalian MSS of the Acts and the Catholic and Pauline Epistles. But he was somewhat indiscriminate in his method, and was too ready to accept the fullest MS as the best witness to the Euthalian tradition. A critical edition of the Euthalian apparatus is greatly needed. The present essay will, I hope, do something to clear the way for such an edition, and may perhaps stimulate some scholar to undertake it.

Zacagni's conclusions with regard to Euthalius may be summarised as follows. The first Masorete of the New Testament, as he terms him (pref. liv), was a deacon of Alexandria, who at the request of some unnamed Father put forth in A.D. 458 an

edition of the Pauline Epistles, written, not continuously, but in short sense-lines (*στιχηδόν*), as an aid to intelligible reading. He prefixed a Prologue which contained an account of S. Paul's life, a brief sketch of the contents of his Epistles, and a discussion of the chronology of S. Paul based on the works of Eusebius. To this he added lists of the O. T. citations found in the Pauline Epistles, and lists of chapter summaries derived from another unnamed Father, whose date was probably A.D. 396. At a later period Euthalius, now become bishop of Sulca, a place not to be identified with certainty, followed up his work on the Pauline Epistles by a similar edition of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, dedicating it to his 'brother Athanasius,' that is to say, to the second archbishop of Alexandria who bore that name.

These, in brief, are the results of Zacagni's learned investigations, and they have been accepted almost without question until the present day. Mill (proll. 907) added to them the suggestion that the Father, from whom Euthalius borrowed the chapter summaries of the Pauline Epistles, was no other than Theodore of Mopsuestia; and this view has received the support of recent critics.

2. A new impetus was given to the study of the Euthalian question, when M. H. Omont¹ published a complete transcription, together with two pages of *facsimile*, of the scanty remains of the Greek Codex H of the Pauline Epistles, whose 41 leaves are scattered in the libraries of Paris, Mt Athos, Moscow, S. Petersburg, Kieff and Turin². M. Omont refers the codex to the second half of the fifth or to the sixth century, and connects it with the Euthalian edition of these Epistles on the ground of the distribution of its text (*στιχηδόν* or *στιχηρόν*). By a strange good fortune the leaf which contains the colophon at the end of the Pauline Epistles is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and of its *recto* M. Omont has given us a photographic reproduction. This colophon is so important to our subject that I must give it in full, only dividing the words and using minuscules for greater clearness.

¹ *Notice sur un très ancien manuscrit grec en onciales des Épitres de Saint Paul* (Paris, 1889): separately reprinted from 'Notices et Extraits' &c., xxxiii. 1.

² The Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris contains 24 of these leaves, and with them may be seen photographs of the leaves preserved in the other libraries, with the exception of those still at Mt Athos.

The page begins with a line of writing now almost completely obliterated, and then we read as follows :

ἔγραψα καὶ ἔξεθέμην κα
τὰ δύναμιν στειχηρὸν·
τόδε τὸ τέυχος πάνδου
5 τοῦ ἀποστόλου· πρὸς ἐγ
γραμμὸν καὶ εὐκατάλημ
πτον ἀνάγνωσιν· τῶν κα
θ' ἡμᾶς ἀδελφῶν· παρ ὧν
ἀπαίτων τόλμης· συν
10 γνώμην ἀιτῶ· εὐχὴ τῇ
ὑπὲρ ἐμῶν· τῇν συνπε
ριφοραν κομιζόμενος·
ἀντεβλήθη δὲ ή βίβλος·
πρὸς τὸ ἐν καισαρίᾳ ἀντί¹⁵
γραφον· τῆς βιβλιοθήκης
τοῦ ἀγιου παμφίλου· χειρὶ

On the *verso* we have :

γεγραμμένου
προσφώνησις·~
Κορωνις ἐιμὶ δογμά
των θέων διδάσκαλος·
5 ἀν τίνι με χρήσης· ἀντί¹⁵
βιβλον λαμβάνε οἱ γὰρ·
ἀπόδοται κακόι·
ἀντίφρασις·~
Θησαυρὸν ἔχων σε πνί¹⁵
ιο κῶν ἀγαθῶν· καὶ πᾶσιν
ἀνθρώποις ποθητὸν·
ἀρμονίαις τὲ καὶ ποικί²⁵
λαις γραμμαῖς κεκοσμη
μένον· νὴ τὴν ἀλήθεια·
οὐ δώσω σε προχείρως
τινί· οὐδὲ αὖ φθονέσω τῆς

The accents and breathings are due to the later hand which has retraced the letters with a corrosive ink. The letters of *προσφωνησις* and *αντιφρασις* are in red ink, and are not retraced. The accents of *τέυχος*, *πάνυλον*, perhaps point to a time when these words were pronounced as in the present day, *tevchos*, *pavlou*. In line 9 of the *recto* the *facsimile* shews that the original scribe wrote *συν*, not *συγ* (Omont¹), which is from the later hand.

This colophon, then, tells us that the codex to which it applies was *compared with*, that is, corrected by, a codex which was written by Pamphilus, the famous friend of Eusebius, and was preserved at the time in question in the library of Caesarea. It does not in the least follow that Codex H itself was the manuscript so compared and corrected. Colophons of this kind are frequently copied by scribes from one manuscript into another. I have given an example of this in my edition of the Philocalia of Origen (p. xxviii). The ms of Origen *contra Celsum* from which all other known MSS are taken contains the following colophon: *μετεβλήθη καὶ ἀντεβλήθη ἐξ ἀντιγράφων τῶν αὐτοῦ ὡριγένους βιβλίων*. But that codex cannot be earlier than the 13th century. Moreover the same words are reproduced in copies taken from it in the 14th and 16th centuries.

It is possible that Codex H is copied line for line from the ms to which the colophon actually refers. In the curious appeal made lower down by the book to its owner a complete line of writing seems to have been dropped. The words look like the adaptation of some earlier iambics. We may write them thus:

Κορωνίς εἰμι δογμάτων [θείων] διδάσκαλος.
ἀν τινὶ με χρήσης ἀντιβιβλον λάμβανε.
οἱ γὰρ <λαβόντες βιβλί> ἀποδόται κακοί.

Some supplement is needful in order to give an intelligible sense to the last clause; and the letters which I have inserted might form a line in Codex H, and, on our supposition, in the ms from which it is copied. The evil practice which the warning implies is probably not so modern as to be an anachronism.

We shall have to return to this colophon and its interesting appendices later on.

¹ M. Omont has himself made this correction in a note on p. 56.

3. In September 1891 Dr Albert Ehrhard, then at Strassburg and now at Würzburg, published an important essay on Codex H and Euthalius in the *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* (viii. 9, pp. 385—411). He pointed out that in Codex Neapolitan. II. A. 7 (Ac 83. Gregory, Prolegomm. 2. 627) the same matter is found which we have copied from Codex H. Between the words γεγραμμένον and προσφάνησις, however, comes the 'Navigatio Pauli,' which frequently occurs in MSS containing the Euthalian apparatus. At the end of the piece is the word ὡφελεῖας, which completes the sense. There are other minor variations, but they are not of a kind to make it improbable that the whole of this matter is ultimately derived from Codex H itself. At the beginning, however, there is an important variant: for we read Εὐάγριος ἔγραψα καὶ ἐξεθέμην κ.τ.λ. (cf. Fabric.-Harless v 789). An examination of the *facsimile* of H convinced Dr Ehrhard that, in the almost obliterated line preceding the word *ἔγραψα*, part of the name Εὐάγριος could be traced; and M. Omont examined the original at his request, and confirmed his view.

Zacagni's date for Euthalius (A.D. 458) was derived from a notice in the *Martyrium Pauli*, which follows the Prologue to the Pauline Epistles (Zac. 535 ff.).¹ This is however the second of two dates which this piece contains. For, first of all, we are told that 'the whole time from S. Paul's martyrdom is 330 years, until the present consulship, Arcadius IV. and Honorius III.' Then follows an additional note, which says that 'from that consulship to the present consulship, Leo Augustus I., is 63 years.' Zacagni explained the first date (A.D. 396) as that of the Father from whom Euthalius derived his chapter summaries. He supposed that Euthalius had also borrowed from him this little statement about S. Paul's martyrdom. The later date he regarded as that of Euthalius himself.

It is obvious to suggest that the second date is really that of a copyist of some Euthalian MS, who wished to bring the reckoning down to his own times. Indeed Zacagni himself affords us in his foot-note material confirmatory of this view: for he says that he found the notice containing the second date in some only of his MSS. It appears to be absent from most MSS, as well as from

¹ For the text of the *Martyrium* see below, p. 29 (cf. p. 47).

Oecumenius, who cites this *Martyrium*. Thus the internal and the external evidence combine to deprive it of authority.

Dr Ehrhard, while recognising the earlier date (A.D. 396) as the true one, proposes to take a bold step and dispose of Euthalius himself; substituting for him Evagrius Ponticus, who lived in Egypt at the end of the fourth century. His argument in brief is this. The colophon of H is clearly by the same hand as the recognised 'Euthalian' apparatus. (His proof of this he works out by a series of parallels.) But this colophon, as the Cod. Neap. has helped us to see, began with the name of Εὐάγριος. Euthalius has always been a mysterious person: now deacon, now bishop; now of Alexandria, now of Sulca, wherever that may be: his name, moreover, is wanting entirely in many MSS, while in one codex at least Pamphilus takes his place. Evagrius Ponticus died in 399: his claim to the authorship of the 'Euthalian' edition at least deserves a hearing.

I am surprised that Dr Ehrhard, who has gathered together an immense collection of details illustrating the whole subject, should have failed to notice that Fabricius-Harless (v. 789), to which he refers for a description of the Neapolitan codex, tells us that this codex has at the end of the Prologue to the Pauline Epistles these words:

Εὐάγριος διελὼν τὰς ἀναγνώσεις καὶ ἐκστιχίσας πᾶσαν τὴν ἀποστολικὴν βίβλον ἀκριβῶς κατὰ ν.' στίχους καὶ τὰ κεφάλαια ἐκάστης ἀναγνώσεως παρέθηκα, καὶ τὰς ἐν αὐτῇ φερομένας μαρτυρίας, ἔτι δὴ καὶ ὅσων ἡ ἀνάγνωσις στίχων τυγχάνει.

If now we turn to Zacagni's edition (p. 541), we find the same note at the close of the ἀνακεφαλαίωσις ἀναγνώσεων κ.τ.λ. for all the Pauline Epistles. But its first words run thus: Διεῖλον τὰς ἀναγνώσεις καὶ ἐστίχισα πᾶσαν τὴν κ.τ.λ. It is evident at once that διεῖλον and ἐστίχισα are the true readings. It is further to be observed that the anonymous form of the note is in harmony with similar notes on pp. 413 and 479. It is possible of course that the name of Evagrius has been systematically suppressed in all these places.

4. Whatever judgment we may pass on Dr Ehrhard's view, of which I have only given the merest outline, we must be grateful to him for the many facts to which he has drawn our attention

in the exposition of it. His essay soon called forth another of perhaps equal importance in the same Journal (*Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, 1893, x. 2, pp. 49—70) by Ernst von Dobschütz of Berlin. Herr von Dobschütz holds that Codex H, so far as its mutilated condition allows us to judge of it, represents a comparatively late and incomplete form of the Euthalian edition, and that the writer of its colophon borrowed its Euthalian phraseology from the genuine Prologues. In this latter view he revives a suggestion made long ago by Montfaucon (*Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, p. 261). He gives us some interesting information derived from an independent study of Euthalian MSS, and inclines to maintain Zacagni's view of the two dates in the *Martyrium Pauli*, and to assign the first part of it to Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the second to Euthalius.

We pass on from these two important contributions to the Euthalian problem, which appear hitherto to have escaped notice in England, to speak of some interesting work which has lately been published on the same subject in our own country.

5. In reprinting in 1893 his valuable Essay on Stichometry, which summarises the researches of Graux and others and applies their results to Biblical codices, Dr Rendel Harris added as an appendix a Lecture on the origin of Codices A and B. In the earlier part of his book he had discussed at some length the stichometry found in Zacagni's edition of Euthalius, and in this appendix he endeavours to throw light upon some of the obscurities which surround his personality and his work. The Euthalian Prologues to the Acts and the Catholic Epistles are addressed to a certain Athanasius (ἀδελφὲ Ἀθανάσιε προσφίλεστατε Z. 409; ἀδελφὲ Ἀθανάσιε τιμιώτατε Z. 476). If, with Zacagni, we accept A.D. 458 as the date of the Euthalian edition of the Pauline Epistles, more than 30 years must elapse before the edition of the Acts and Catholic Epistles could be dedicated to the younger archbishop Athanasius. But this long interval is inconsistent with the statements of the Prologue to the Acts. Dr Harris observed that throughout this Prologue the writer is perpetually playing with the word μελέτη, illustrating from all sources the importance of the study of the Scriptures. He believes that in one passage Euthalius distinctly refers to Μελέτη

as 'the namesake' of the Father to whom he dedicates his edition¹: and with great ingenuity he suggests that this Father's real name was Meletius; that he is to be identified with Meletius of Mopsuestia; and that the name of Athanasius was afterwards introduced by scribes, who wished to substitute an orthodox Father for an exiled heretic. Meletius was a pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and thus we come round by a new route to the suggestion of Mill that it was from Theodore that Euthalius borrowed his chapter summaries for the Pauline Epistles.

Dr Harris further discusses the colophon of Cod. H, noting the parallel between its phraseology and that of the Prologue to the Acts. His object is to confirm the connection of Euthalius with Caesarea; for this connection has become of importance, since, as he had already pointed out, the *second* numeration of the chapters of the Acts in Zacagni's codex corresponds with the earlier numeration in the margin of Cod. B.

As the title of the Prologue to the Acts has hitherto been *Eὐθαλίου...πρὸς Ἀθανάσιον*, it is curious to see that, while a German scholar has disposed of Euthalius, an English scholar has unseated Athanasius. If we were free to combine their results, we should have as our new title *Εὐαγγέλιου...πρὸς Μελέτιον*. But I am afraid that neither of the critics could consent to this juxtaposition.

6. In an article in the *Journal of Philology* (1895, vol. XXIII., no. 46, pp. 241—259) Mr F. C. Conybeare of Oxford makes an interesting contribution to the Euthalian question. He points out that an Armenian codex (c. A.D. 1270) of the Acts and Epistles in the British Museum (Add. 19,730), which contains the Euthalian Prologues, has likewise at the end of the Epistle to Philemon the colophon and the quaint notices following it, which we have been considering above. The same matter is found, he tells us, in the same place in an entire Bible (A.D. 1220) at S. Lazzaro, and in another belonging to Lord Zouche. The Greek original of the colophon he rightly finds in Codex H: but he is unaware that the 'Address' and 'Reply' are also there².

¹ *Zac.* p. 406: Harris, *Stichometry*, p. 80.

² They are printed in Montfaucon's *Bibliotheca Coisliniana* (Paris, 1715, p. 261), but not in Dr Gregory's description of Codex H.

This latter fact, however, greatly strengthens his argument for the close connection between the Armenian MSS named above and Codex H.

It should be noted, further, that part of the colophon is cited at the end of Philemon by Zohrab, the learned editor of the Venice Bible (1805, p. 824 n.), who referred it conjecturally to the pen of Euthalius. The whole with its appendices is given by Father Carekin (*Cat. of Anc. Arm. Translations*, p. 139) from the Venice Codex, where the text does not greatly differ from that of the British Museum ms. The words, however, which in the latter ms represented *κατὰ δύναμιν* are wanting. Both texts give at the close of the 'Reply,' after the words 'nor again will I grudge the benefit of any,' the following addition: 'but, when I lend thee to my friends, I will take a goodly copy in exchange¹'. There follows, likewise in both texts, the 'Navigatio Pauli.'

The mutilated condition of Codex H allows us little opportunity of judging of the extent of the apparatus which it originally contained; but enough is left before Galatians, 1 Timothy and Titus, to prove that the spurious *hypotheses* prefixed to the Epistles, which even Zacagni rejected, were not included in that codex. Nor are they found in the Armenian ms, B. M. Add. 19,730. Here then we have a fresh point of connection between these codices.

It is well to observe at this point that the Euthalian apparatus is given in a fuller form in some Armenian MSS; as may be seen by a reference to Zohrab's edition, where, for example, the spurious *hypotheses* are printed before the list of chapters of each Epistle. This may suggest that there was a tendency from time to time to supplement the Armenian Version by the addition of apparatus taken over from Greek codices.

This variation between Armenian codices in the matter of their subsidiary apparatus receives a further illustration from the *Martyrium Pauli*, to which reference has already been made.

¹ The Greek for this is found in the Neapolitan Codex, which as von Dobschütz points out, in correction of a statement of Ehrhard, continues after *ῳφελεῖας* thus: *χρήσω δὲ τοῖς φίλοις, ἀξιόπιστον ἀντίβιβλον λαμβάνων* (*Centralblatt für Bibl.* x. 2, p. 59 f.). The Armenian translator has misunderstood *ἀντίβιβλον*, which, as von Dobschütz (*ibid.*) shews, means a 'receipt' or 'quittance.'

Zohrab prints it, where Zacagni too has it, at the end of the Prologue to the Pauline Epistles. Mr Conybeare says that it is in Lord Zouche's Bible, though he does not tell us at what place it occurs. But B. M. Add. 19,730 and (apparently) the Venice Bible of 1220 A.D. do not contain it.

Mr Conybeare rightly points out that, where the *Martyrium* does occur in Armenian Bibles, it is found in the shorter form: that is to say, it does not contain the interpolated second date, which, as Zacagni's foot-note had shewn us, is not found in all the Greek MSS.

To the theory which Mr Conybeare bases on the connection between Cod. H and certain Armenian codices we shall come in a later chapter. At present we must pass on with an expression of our gratitude to him, as the first Western scholar who has directed our attention to the existence of the colophon of H in an Armenian form.

For the history of the colophon it is important to note that the perplexing name of Evagrius does not occur in the Armenian copies.

CHAPTER II.

THE WORK DONE BY EUTHALIUS.

THE actual work done by Euthalius for his edition of the Pauline Epistles and of the Acts and Catholic Epistles is a subject which deserves a critical treatment. Even Zacagni was not prepared to ascribe everything which he found in his Codex Regio-Alexandrinus to the pen of Euthalius himself. Thus he took objection to the *Argumenta* or ‘Τποθέσεις prefixed to the several Epistles, on the ground that their statements contradicted those of the subscriptions of the Epistles which he regarded as Euthalian: and he rejected also a series of Church lessons which he found in the margin of his codex.

Our first duty must be to collect and examine the statements which Euthalius makes in his Prologues with regard to the work which he has undertaken. We may then go on to enquire what portions of the existing apparatus tally with the author's own account of his enterprise.

Euthalius's own description of his work.

We begin with the earlier work, the edition of the Pauline Epistles. The Prologue begins (Zac. 515) with a statement that the work is undertaken in obedience to the command of one whom Euthalius addresses as 'most honoured Father' ($\pi\acute{a}τερ \tau\acute{i}μiώτatē$). May he steer the ship by his prayers that it may reach the desired haven! Then follows (Z. 516 ff.) a life of S. Paul, closing with the mention of the day on which his festival is kept in Rome. Next comes (Z. 523) a series of brief summaries of his fourteen Epistles. The Epistle to the Hebrews is placed after 2 Thessalonians. In connection with the Epistle to Philemon we are told that Onesimus

was martyred at Rome under Tertullus by the breaking of his legs. The sentences which follow must be given in full (Z. 528):

Οὔτως ἡ πᾶσα βίβλος περιέχει παντοῖον εἶδος πολιτειῶν κατὰ προσαύξησιν. καὶ τὰ μὲν κατ’ ἐπιτομὴν παρ’ ἡμῶν εἰρήσθω περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτο· καθ’ ἔκάστην δὲ συντόμως ἐπιστολὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔξης προτάξομεν τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἔκθεσιν, ἐνὶ τῶν σοφωτάτων τινὶ καὶ φιλοχρίστων πατέρων ἡμῶν πεποιημένην οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀναγνώσεων ἀκριβεστάτην τομήν, τὴν τε τῶν θείων μαρτυριῶν εὐαπόδεκτον εὑρεσιν ἡμεῖς τεχνολογήσαντες ἀνεκεφαλαιωσάμεθα, ἐπιπορευόμενοι τῇ τῆς ὑφῆς ἀναγνώσει ἔκθησόμεθα δ’ οὖν ταύτην εὐθὺς μετὰ τόνδε τὸν πρόλογον.

I have here followed mainly B. M. Add. 28,816¹. The only important variant is the reading of Vat. 363, Cryptoferrat, and Regio-Alex., which Zacagni gives in a foot-note: *τὴν δὲ τῶν θείων*. This would seem to make the list of quotations the only part of the work claimed by Euthalius as original.

It is to be noted that there appears to be no reference here to any work upon the text itself: only preliminary matter is spoken of. The Prologue is to be immediately followed by a table for the finding of quotations, and then before each Epistle separately we may expect the *ἔκθεσις κεφαλαίων*. What is meant by *τὴν τῶν ἀναγνώσεων ἀκριβεστάτην τομήν* is not clear; as indeed it is uncertain whether it should be taken with the preceding or the following sentence: possibly it is to be interpreted by the later expression (Z. 405), *μετρίας ταῖς τῆς ὀλιγομαθοῦς ἡμῶν ἀναγνώσεως τομαῖς*.

We now turn to the later work, the edition of the Acts and Catholic Epistles. Here the Prologue opens by saying (Z. 403) that those who seek immortality study the Scriptures night and day. Their commands, when they ask our assistance, cannot be disobeyed without peril.

Πρῶτον δὴ οὖν ἔγωγε τὴν ἀποστολικὴν βίβλον στιχηδὸν² ἀναγνούς τε καὶ γράψας πρώην διεπεμψάμην πρός τινα τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ πατέρων ἡμῶν, μετρίως πεποιημένην ἐμοί, οἵᾳ τις πώλος ἀβαδῆς ἡ νέος ἀμαθῆς ἐρήμην ὁδὸν καὶ ἀτριβῆ ἵέναι προστεταγ-

¹ Written A.D. 1111 (Ac 205 P 477). It reads *ἐν ἡ τῶν φιλοσοφοτάτων κ.τ.λ.* I have used it also from time to time in the following extracts.

² So B. M. Add. 28,816. The mss perpetually vary between *στιχηδὸν*, *στοιχιδὸν* and *στοιχηδὸν*.

μένος. οὐδένα γάρ που τῶν ὅστοι τὸν θεῖον ἐπρεσβεύσαντο λόγον εἰς δεῦρο διέγνων περὶ τοῦτο τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης εἰς σπουδὴν πεποιημένον τὸ σχῆμα. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνὴρ αὐθάδης οὕτως οὐδὲ τολμηρὸς ἦν, ως τοῖς ἑτέροις (Ζ. τοὺς ἑτέρους: *fors.* τοὺς ἑτέροις) εὐ μάλα πεποιημένους πόνους αὐτὸς ἀφειδῶς καθυβρίζειν μετρίαις ταῖς τῆς ὀλιγομαθοῦς ἡμῶν ἀναγνώσεως τομαῖς. ἔναγχος τοίνυν, ως ἔφην, τὴν Παύλου βίβλον ἀνεγνωκάς, αὐτίκα δὴ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ τήνδε τὴν τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πράξεων ἄμα τῇ τῶν καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἐβδομάδι πονέσας, ἀρτίως σοι πέπομφα, συγγνώμην γε πλείστην αἰτῶν ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν τόλμης ὁμοῦ καὶ προπετείας τῆς ἐμῆς.

Later on (Ζ. 409) we read: ...ἔναγχος ἐμοίγε τὴν τε τῶν πράξεων βίβλον ἄμα καὶ καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀναγνῶναι τε κατὰ προσφορίαν καὶ πῶς ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι καὶ διελεῖν τούτων ἐκάστης τὸν νοῦν λεπτομερῶς προσέταξα, ἀδελφὲ Ἀθανάσιε προσφιλέστατε. καὶ τοῦτο ἀόκνως ἐγὼ καὶ προθύμως πεποιηκώς, στιχηδόν τε συνθεὶς τούτων τὸ ὑφος κατὰ τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ συμμετρίαν πρὸς εὔσημον ἀνάγνωσιν, διεπεμψάμην ἐν βραχεῖ τὰ ἔκαστά σοι, κατ' ἀκολουθίαν ἐκθέμενος ὀλιγοστὴν ἀνακεφαλαιώσιν, πρῶτον περὶ ὧν Λουκᾶς ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς συνέταξε προοιμιασάμενος.

A few lines about S. Luke and his work follow, and so the Prologue closes.

From these notices we gain fresh light as to the earlier work on the Pauline Epistles. We see that Euthalius felt that he was there breaking new ground in one important particular. He was contributing to an intelligent reading of the sacred text by distributing it into short sentences. This work is described by various phrases: *στιχηδὸν ἀναγνούς τε καὶ γράψας—μετρίαις ταῖς τῆς ὀλιγομαθοῦς ἡμῶν ἀναγνώσεως τομαῖς—ἀναγνῶναι κατὰ προσφορίαν—στιχηδὸν συνθεὶς τούτων τὸ ὑφος κατὰ τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ συμμετρίαν πρὸς εὔσημον ἀνάγνωσιν.*

In his new book he is to do this for the Acts and Catholic Epistles, and at the same time to give a summary of the contents of each Epistle arranged in chapters. He says nothing here of a table of quotations.

To the Catholic Epistles a much briefer Prologue is prefixed.

“Even small ventures are perilous to small men. I am very small, and my labours far too great for my safety. My little skiff must inevitably go down in the storm, but that I plead obedience,

and claim indulgence and prayer on my behalf." At the close (Z. 477) we read: Ἐγὼ δέ τοι στιχηδὸν τὰς καθολικὰς καθεξῆς ἐπιστολὰς ἀναγνώσομαι, τὴν τῶν κεφαλαίων ἔκθεσιν ἄμα καὶ θείων μαρτυριῶν μετρίως ἐνθένδε ποιούμενος.

Here the three parts of his work are briefly enumerated: the distribution of the text into sentences, the chapter summaries, and the table of quotations.

Examination of Zacagni's materials.

Bearing in mind the statement of Euthalius (Z. 529) that the table of quotations will immediately follow the Prologue to the Pauline Epistles, we turn to Zacagni's edition to see what is actually presented to us. Here (p. 535) the Prologue is succeeded by

- (1) *Μαρτύριον Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου.*
- (2) *'Ανακεφαλαίωσις τῶν ἀναγνώσεων καὶ ὡν ἔχουσι κεφαλαίων καὶ μαρτυριῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, καὶ ὅσων ἑκάστη τούτων στίχων τυγχάνει.* (Z. 537.)
- (3) *Πρόγραμμα* of 10 lines (Z. 542), explaining the use of black and red numeration in what follows, viz.,
- (4) *'Ανακεφαλαίωσις θείων μαρτυριῶν*—a brief summary.
- (5) *Πρόγραμμα* of 26 lines (Z. 548), explaining the use of black and red numeration in what follows, viz.,
- (6) *'Ανακεφαλαίωσις θείων μαρτυριῶν*—a full table in which the words of the quotations are given.
- (7) A list of the Pauline Epistles, and a note on their number.
- (8) *'Τπόθεσις πρώτης πρὸς Ρωμαίους ἐπιστολῆς.*
- (9) *"Εκθεσις κεφαλαίων* for the Epistle to the Romans.

The Tables of Lections.

It is obvious at a glance that we have here something more than Euthalius had promised us. Reserving the *μαρτύριον Παύλου* for treatment later on, let us look first at (2), the *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις τῶν ἀναγνώσεων*. A similar table follows the Prologue to the Acts, but Zacagni found it only in his Codex Regio-Alex. Of

the like table which follows the Prologue to the Catholic Epistles he says that he found it in that codex and in Cryptoferratensis, but in no other: and this seems to hold also for the Pauline Epistles. These tables of *ἀναγνώσεις*, then, are wanting in most of the Euthalian MSS. Let us examine their contents.

The Epistle to the Romans has 5 *ἀναγνώσεις*, 19 *κεφάλαια*, 48 *μαρτυρίαι*, 920 *στίχοι*. The details we may abbreviate by tabulation :

<i>ἀναγνώσεις.</i>	<i>κεφάλαια.</i>	<i>μαρτυρίαι.</i>	<i>στίχοι.</i>
I	4 (1—4)	9 (1—9)	242
II	9 (5—13)	1 (10)	248
III	3 (14—16)	26 (11—36)	185
IV	1 (17)	6 (37—42)	125
V	2 (18, 19)	6 (43—48)	125

The *στίχοι* when added up make 925 instead of 920: probably the error has come in by assimilation of the numbers for lections IV and V. Similar calculations are given for each of the other Pauline Epistles, and for all of them taken together.

These *ἀναγνώσεις* are not only very long, but also curiously irregular in length, as a glance at the table for the Romans will shew. Zacagni notes, as the beginnings of the five into which this Epistle is divided, Ro i. 1, v. 1, ix. 1, xii. 1, xv. 1: that is to say, the first and second lections each contain four of the chapters into which our modern Bibles are divided; the third and fourth each contain three of our chapters; and the fifth contains two. Similarly 1 Corinthians divides thus: i. 1, vii. 1, viii. 1, xii. 1, xv. 1. This coincidence with the first verses of our chapters is not constant; there appear to be four exceptions, 2 Co iv. 7, Gal iii. 15, Col iii. 17, Heb vii. 11: the main breaks in an Epistle however would naturally fall at places where one of our chapters closes and another begins.

What is the origin of these long lections, or what purpose they ever served, I cannot tell. They look like the divisions of a commentator, rather than lections for reading in Church. At first sight it might seem that we have here the *ἀκριβεστάτη τῶν ἀναγνώσεων τομή*, promised us by Euthalius in his Prologue (Z. 529): but the absence of these tables from the great majority

of Euthalian codices¹ is against this: as is also the fact that they do not appear in any form in the subsequent tables, not even in that of the chapter summaries. It is possible that the words of Euthalius were interpreted in a wrong sense, and accordingly led to the insertion of these tables of ἀναγνώσεις to fill what appeared to be a gap in the apparatus.

On the whole it will be wisest for the present to abstain from attributing these tables to Euthalius himself.

Before we leave them, two points deserve our attention:

(1) The title of the Acts of the Apostles in Codex Χ, at the beginning of the book and wherever it occurs as a headline, is simply Πράξεις. The subscription² in Χ however speaks of it as Πράξεις ἀποστόλων, which is its title³ in B and in D. All other MSS seem to have a fuller title still. Origen seems to refer to the book most frequently by the shortest title, Πράξεις.

Now it may be accidental, but it is certainly worth noting, that Euthalius in referring to the book in his Prologue to the Acts and in his undoubtedly genuine tables of quotations and chapter summaries never uses the name Πράξεις ἀποστόλων. Thus we have: Z. 403 Πρόλογος τῶν πράξεων, Z. 405 τὴν τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πράξεων (βίβλου), Z. 409 τὴν τῶν πράξεων βίβλου, Z. 410 τὴν περὶ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν πράξεων (βίβλου), Z. 415 ἀνακεφαλαίωσις θείων μαρτυριῶν τῆς βίβλου τῶν πράξεων, Z. 421 ἀπάσαι αἱ μαρτυρίαι τῶν πράξεων λα', Z. 428 κεφάλαια τῶν πράξεων. In the Prologue to the Pauline Epistles we have indeed (Z. 531) Λουκᾶς ὁ τὰς πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφῆ παραδούς, and in the next sentence ἵστορεῖ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων: but πράξεις alone is found twice a little later on (Z. 534).

But the table of ἀναγνώσεις with which we have been dealing has at the beginning and at the end the title ἡ βίβλος τῶν πράξεων τῶν ἀποστόλων. A similar title occurs elsewhere in the materials published by Zacagni (pp. 414, 421 bis, 428, 443); but

¹ The table for the Acts occurs in a somewhat shorter form in the Armenian Codex, Brit. Mus. Add. 19,730: and in w^{scr} (Trin. Coll. Camb. B. 10. 16) in the case of the Pauline Epp. the number of ἀναγνώσεις is recorded in the subscriptions to the Epistles: so too in Neap. II. A. 7 (v. Dobschütz).

² The subscription is by the hand that wrote the text of the Acts; the titles and headlines by the *diorthotes* (D): Tisch. N. T. Sin. (1863) p. xxii.

³ Also its subscription in B; but not its headline, which is πράξεις.

in every case there are strong reasons for rejecting the sections or headings containing it.

(2) Each of the three tables of *ἀναγνώσεις* is closed with a short note which repeats in part the language of its title. Thus, for the Acts: διεῖλον τὰς ἀναγνώσεις τῆς βίβλου τῶν πράξεων τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τὰ κεφάλαια ἐκάστης ἀναγνώσεως παρέθηκα καὶ τὰς ἐν αὐτῇ φερομένας μαρτυρίας, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ὅσων ἐκάστη στίχων τυγχάνει (Z. 413). The note for the Catholic Epistles is exactly similar. Now we have no ground for attributing to Euthalius any interest at all in stichometry proper; that is, in the enumeration of measured *στίχοι*, as opposed to what is conveniently called colometry, or the distribution of the text into sense-lines. So that it is satisfactory to get rid of these two notes. The third (Z. 541) must go with them: διεῖλον τὰς ἀναγνώσεις καὶ ἐστίχισα πᾶσαν τὴν ἀποστολικὴν βίβλον ἀκριβῶς κατὰ πεντήκοντα στίχους, καὶ τὰ κεφάλαια ἐκάστης ἀναγνώσεως κ.τ.λ. This is the place where, as we learnt from Fabricius, the name of Evagrius is found in the Neapolitan codex. Moreover it is the passage which has been used to accentuate the stichometrical zeal of Euthalius, who is supposed to have made his own calculation of the *στίχοι*, noting in his margin every fiftieth occurrence. We shall probably not esteem him the less, when he is stripped of his mathematical honours.

The Short Tables of Quotations.

So much for the table of *ἀναγνώσεις*. The next to go is the first and much more condensed table of quotations. Let us begin by considering that prefixed to the Acts. We shall not reject it on the ground that its heading speaks of *πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων*, though that may arouse our suspicion: nor because it says ὁμοῦ μαρτυρίαι λα', whereas Euthalius says ἀπάσαι αἱ μαρτυρίαι τῶν πράξεων λα'. Our first ground of objection is that it has no special use in a book which contains the fuller table, though it is arranged according to the books of the O. T., and not according to the sequence of the Acts. Our second ground is that it is inconsistent with the fuller table. This short table contains one quotation from Deuteronomy, the longer table contains none:

for this particular quotation it ascribes, though wrongly, to Exodus. Now the short table reckons it also among the quotations from Exodus; so that it has it twice. How is it then that both tables reckon 31 quotations for the whole of the Acts? If we look at Zacagni's edition (p. 420) we see that in the fuller list No. 24 is altogether missing. This he explains on the ground that it is in fact only a partial repetition of No. 4, and as such it seems to be marked in the margin of the text where it occurs. But the compiler of the short table has dropped it altogether, and so he is able to present the same total as he found in the fuller table.

At the close of the first table of quotations in the Pauline Epistles, we have a list of the places from which these Epistles were written. They correspond with those mentioned in the subscriptions to the Epistles. Another list follows in which the Epistles are distributed according as to whether S. Paul writes in his own name alone, or joins another with him in the opening salutation, or remains anonymous as in the Epistle to the Hebrews. None of this matter has any claim to a Euthalian origin.

With these short tables, which we may now dismiss, will go the *programmata* which explain the use of black and red numeration which is found in them.

The Full Tables of Quotations.

We pass on now to the fuller tables of quotations. There seems no reason to doubt that these are the genuine work of Euthalius in fulfilment of the pledge given in his Prologues. The quotations in the Acts, for example (Z. 415—421), are copied out in full, part of their New Testament context sometimes finding a place with them. To each is prefixed a number, which will be found later on in the margin of the text itself. Beside O. T. quotations, we find two (i. 5, xiii. 25) from S. Matthew, one (xvii. 28) from Aratus the Astronomer and Homer the Poet, and one (xx. 35) from the Apostolic Constitutions. The table is perfectly simple: it requires no *programma*, and has none.

The corresponding table of quotations in the Pauline Epistles is provided with a double numeration. The first series of numerals is red, and begins afresh with each Epistle: the second series is

black, and is continuous throughout the fourteen Epistles, shewing how often, up to the point indicated, the same book has been quoted by S. Paul. Thus for 1 Co ii. 16 we have the following enumeration (Z. 556) :

III. [vβ']. Ἡσαίου προφήτου ις'.

This means that the quotation is the fourth quotation in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and that the Apostle now quotes for the sixteenth time from the Prophet Isaiah; one such quotation having already occurred in this Epistle and 14 in the Epistle to the Romans. The number which I have bracketed is an insertion of Zacagni's, based on a misunderstanding of the preceding *programma*. Two questions arise at this point: is this double enumeration original? and did Euthalius himself use red and black to distinguish between the two series?

The treatment of the Pauline Epistles as a single book, which is implied in the second enumeration, is attested by the ancient chapter numbers in Cod. B, which form one series throughout the fourteen Epistles. It is further attested for the ms which gave these numbers to B by the breaks in the series caused by the change of the position of Hebrews, which must once have followed Galatians, whereas in B it follows 2 Thessalonians.

But in Codex H, from which unhappily all the prefatory matter is now lost, we find only the first series in the margin of the text¹. Thus against Heb ii. 13 we have :

\bar{i}	$\bar{18}$
ΗσαΐοΥ	ΗσαΐοΥ

These correspond to X. and XI. of Zacagni's table (p. 563). In later codices we should find underneath them $\bar{\kappa\tau}$ and $\bar{\kappa\delta}$, as they are the 23rd and 24th citations from Isaiah which occur in the book of the Pauline Epistles. Either, then, we must say that Codex H has given us the Euthalian tradition at this point in an incomplete

¹ In quotations from the Psalms we have a double enumeration: but the lower number is that of the Psalm itself. Thus at Heb ii. 12 we have :

$\bar{\theta}$	$\bar{\psi\alpha\lambda\hat{\eta}}$
.	$\bar{\kappa\delta}$

the quotation being no. IX in the Epistle, and from Ps xxi. (xxii.).

form: or we must say that the second numeration is one of the many later elaborations of Euthalius's more simple scheme. To my mind the latter alternative is the more reasonable. If we accept it, the distinction of black and red numeration falls of course to a period subsequent to that of Euthalius himself.

The table for the Pauline Epistles is closed by two lists. The first of these (Z. 568 f.) gives the numbers of the quotations which occur more than once in the Epistles. There is no reason to assign it to Euthalius: it is probably from the hand of the compiler of the first table of quotations. The second (Z. 569) is a mere list of titles of the Epistles. It begins: Τάδε ἔνεστιν. Παύλου ἐπιστολαί. ἡ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, κ.τ.λ. It is somewhat belated where it occurs, and is probably a subsequent addition.

The Pseudo-Athanasiian Summaries.

The next instalment in the apparatus of the Pauline Epistles is a short note (Z. 570) headed: Διὰ τί Παύλου ἐπιστολαὶ δεκατέσσαρες λέγονται. The heading is absurd; for the note itself does not attempt to answer the question: and both it and the ὑπόθεσις to the Epistle to the Romans which follows it are interpolations into the Euthalian work. They come, as was pointed out by Matthaei and also independently by von Dobschütz, from the Synopsis attributed to S. Athanasius (see Appendix).

The Tables of Chapter Summaries.

1. Next we come to the summaries of the chapters of the Romans (Z. 573). Here we find two headings. The second is probably original: *κεφάλαια τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῆς Παύλου ιθ'.* The first is a general heading for all the Epistles, and is clearly out of place. It is omitted in Zohrab's edition of the Armenian Bible, and is perhaps spurious. It runs as follows: "Εκθεσις κεφαλαίων καθολικῶν καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ἔχόντων τινῶν καὶ μερικὰς ὑποδιαιρέσεις τὰς διὰ τοῦ κινναβάρεως: that is to say, some of the chapters have subdivisions which are indicated by red letters. We must consider this in

connection with the first heading to the list of chapters in the Acts.

There (Z. 428) the list is headed *κεφάλαια τῶν πράξεων*, but we find a note before it to which is prefixed *ἔκθεσις κεφαλαίων τῶν πράξεων τῶν ἀποστόλων*. We observe, in passing, that the heading of this note gives us the longer title of the Acts.

The note must be given in full.

'Εκ πατέρων ἡμεῖς καὶ διδασκάλων τὸν τρόπον καὶ τὸν τύπον ὥφελημένοι ἐγχειροῦμεν μετρίως τῆδε τῶν κεφαλαίων ἔκθέσει, αἰτοῦντες συγγνώμην προπετείας, ἡμεῖς οἱ νέοι χρόνων τε καὶ μαθημάτων παρ' ὑμῶν ἐκάστου τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων, εὐχῇ τῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν συμπεριφορὰν κομιζόμενοι. ἔκτιθέμεθα γοῦν αὐτὴν καθ' ἵστορίαν Λουκᾶ τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ καὶ συγγραφέως. τοιγαροῦν διὰ μὲν τοῦ μέλανος αὐτοτελῆ τὰ κεφάλαια, διὰ δὲ τοῦ κινναβάρεως τὰς ἐν μέρει τούτων ἔχομένας ὑποδιαιρέσεις ἐσημειωσάμεθα.

This note differs from other personal statements which we have found reason to reject, inasmuch as the writer speaks not in the first person singular, but in the first person plural. The tone of it is quite in harmony with the Prologues, and the flowing style and the distinctive phraseology (*μετρίως, εὐχῇ τῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, συμπεριφοράν*) remind us of Euthalius. The only serious doubt arises when we come to the last sentence. We have refused to Euthalius the distinction of black and red in the numeration of quotations. Is it genuine here?

Now there is no reason why Euthalius, had he so desired, should not have used a red pigment (*κιννάβαρι*), as Eusebius seems to have done in his Chronicon and in his table of Canons. But we have a good ground for doubting whether he actually did.

Montfaucon in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana* (pp. 78 ff.) cites from a tenth century ms (Coislin. xxv.) the following matter which is prefixed to a Catena on the Acts and Catholic Epistles, stated in a colophon to have been compiled by a certain presbyter named Andreas:

"Ἐκθεσις κεφαλαίων τῶν πράξεων τοῦ Παμφίλου.

'Εκ πατέρων ἡμεῖς καὶ διδασκάλων κ.τ.λ. as above.

The last sentence however runs thus: *τοιγαροῦν διὰ μὲν τοῦ ἄλφα καὶ βῆτα αὐτοτελῆ τὰ κεφάλαια, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀστερίσκου τὰς ἐν μέρει τούτων ἔχομένας ὑποδιαιρέσεις ἐσημειώσαμεθα.* Then follows without a fresh heading: a'. περὶ τῆς ἐξ ἀναστάσεως κ.τ.λ., the first of the chapter summaries. The whole of the summaries Montfaucon prints in full, believing that in them we have a genuine work of Pamphilus of Caesarea. The last chapter number is λθ', the μ' before the last summary having been omitted and the summary made to run on with the preceding one. But the closing note says: *κεφάλαια μὲν τὰ ὅλα μ', τὰ δὲ τούτοις ἐπόμενα ἄτινα τὰς σημειώσεις ἔχουσι διὰ τοῦ ✪ μη'.*

Now all this has an earlier look, when compared with the material which Zacagni gives us. In the first place the words *τῶν ἀποστόλων* are absent from the title. Originally no doubt it ran: *"Εκθεσις τῶν κεφαλαίων τῶν πράξεων.* The addition of *τοῦ Παμφίλου* may be due to the conjecture of Andreas, who may have used a MS written in the Caesarean library. Further, the use of the asterisk in MSS for various purposes is well known from its employment by the Homeric critics and by Origen in his Hexapla. Moreover, if we suppose that at first the subdivisions were marked only by an asterisk¹ and not by letters, whether black or red, we get the explanation of the variation and confusion which we find in regard to these subdivisions in many codices.

Thus in Codex H, where the main chapters are numbered in black and the subdivisions in red, we have (in the chapter summaries of the Epistle to the Hebrews) for chap. ȝ, which has two subdivisions: ȝ in black, with ȝ in red immediately underneath it; then the subdivisions are numbered in red as ȝ and ȝ̄. But in Zacagni's edition the main chapter is not numbered twice, and the subdivisions are numbered as α' and β'. A similar plan is followed in Zohrab's edition of the Armenian Bible.

If the original work of Euthalius marked the subdivisions only

¹ Montfaucon notes that the asterisks have entirely disappeared from the codex in question. So too in Oecumenius (Morel's edn. Paris, 1630) there are no subdivisions marked: though at the end we have *Ἐστι τὰ μὲν αὐτοτελῆ κεφάλαια μ., τὰ δὲ τούτοις ἐπόμενα μη'*.

by asterisks, it is easy to see that, when this primitive notation was replaced by letters, either of the systems described above might be adopted.

In the table prefixed to 1 Timothy in Codex H, chapters $\bar{\sigma}$ and \bar{z} should each be divided, according to the scheme used in this codex, into two parts numbered with $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\bar{\beta}$ in red. For they each contain one subdivision, beginning as usual with the words $\dot{\epsilon}\nu \phi$, and duly marked in each case by Zacagni with the symbol a' . But in Codex H there is no trace here of secondary numeration¹. The reason probably is that the original asterisks had fallen out, or had been neglected by the scribe who substituted letters for asterisks throughout the Codex.

The following systems of numeration are actually found in MSS. I have used minuscules for convenience to represent the red capitals.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
A	A	A	A	A
*	β	α	α	B
*	γ	β	β	Γ
B	B	B	B	Δ
*	β	α	γ	E
*	γ	β	δ	ζ
*	δ	γ	ϵ	Z
Γ	Γ	Γ	Γ	H
*	β	α	ζ	Θ

(1) is that promised, though not given, in Coisl. xxv., as we have seen above.

In the Cambridge University Library two MSS shew asterisks occasionally: Kk vi 4 (saec. xi.) in the margin of the text of 2 Pe and 1 Jo; and Ff i 30 (saec. xi.), where the summaries of the last chapter and subdivision in Colossians are written thus:

ī τὰ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους ὁμονοητικῶς· ἐν ᾧ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἀλλο
* τρίους · ἐμφρόνως · οἰκονομικᾶς : ~

But in the text of Colossians the subdivision is marked with $\bar{\alpha}$.

¹ Von Dobschütz is mistaken in saying that two strokes in the margin indicate the place where a subdivision should have been: for these are the ornaments below and above $\bar{\sigma}$ and \bar{z} respectively.

Again, in the case of Coisl. xxx. (saec. xi.), a Catena on the Pauline Epistles, we have the following heading before the chapter summaries of the Romans: *κεφαλαιών ἔκθεσις καθολικῶν καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐχόντων τινῶν καὶ μερικὰς ὑποδιαιρέσεις τὰς διὰ τὸν σημείον τοῦ ἀστερίσκου*. The subsections of chapter 16 are accordingly marked thus: *ἄ', *β', and so on to *γ'. Here we have a combination of methods (1) and (3).

(2) is the method which is found in Codex H.

(3) is that given by Zacagni, and found in many Greek and Armenian MSS.

(4) is found in Brit. Mus. Add. 28,816 (A.D. 1111) and in Wake 12 at Christ Church, Oxford (saec. xi.); but in the latter the red and black numerals are inverted, contrary to the express statement of the heading of the list.

(5) is found in the Graeco-Armenian codex Paris B.N. Arm. 9 for the Romans, though in other parts of this codex method (3) is employed.

So remarkable a variety in methods of numeration is perhaps most easily explained if we regard the asterisks as the original marks of the subdivisions: and this view is supported by the frequent dropping of subdivisions altogether. It is true, as we shall see hereafter, when we return to this subject in another connection, that even the continuous numbering of the subdivisions was not a sufficient protection against the carelessness of scribes: but it is obvious that an asterisk was far more likely to be dropped, and far less likely to be afterwards replaced, than one of the numbers of a series.

2. After the 40 chapter summaries of the Acts, we find (Z. 438) the following statement: *Καὶ οὐτοὶ οἱ ἀριθμοὶ οὓς εύρήσεις κειμένους* (Cod. Reg. Alex. εύρήσειμένους: emendauit Zac.) *ἐν τῷ τεύχει κατὰ τὸ ὑφος τῆς ἀναγνώσεως μετὰ μ' κεφάλαια καὶ λ' μαρτυρίας εἰσὶν δὲ οἱ πάντες λσ'*.

I. Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον κ.τ.λ.

Hereupon follows a wholly different system of chapters for the Acts, 36 in number, the first words of each chapter being cited. This system was found, it would appear, by Zacagni only in a single codex. It is absent from most Greek codices and, so far as

I am aware, from all codices of the Armenian Version. Dr Harris and Dr Gregory have independently observed that the same system is found in the margin of Cod. B, being the earlier of the two numerations which that codex contains. There is no ground at all for connecting it with the original Edition of Euthalius. We shall return to its consideration later on, in discussing the supposed connection of Euthalius with Caesarea.

3. A word or two must be said before we leave the Euthalian chapter summaries upon a matter which is involved in much obscurity.

Euthalius expressly informs us in his Prologue to the Pauline Epistles (Z. 528; see above, p. 12) that the ἔκθεσις κεφαλαίων, which he prefixed to each Epistle, was the work of an earlier Father. In his prefatory note to the chapter summaries of the Acts he again recognises his obligations to "our fathers and teachers" (Z. 428; see above, p. 21), but in this case only for the τρόπος and τύπος, the method and model of his work.

It is somewhat puzzling to find, on a comparison of the chapter summaries of the Pauline Epistles with those of the Catholic Epistles (and in a less degree, on account of their historical character, those of the Acts as well), so great a similarity of style and phraseology as, apart from the statement of Euthalius himself, would certainly force us to the conclusion that they are all from beginning to end the work of one and the same writer. A few examples may suffice to illustrate this affinity.

- | | |
|---|---|
| Ro viii. ἐπανάληψις περὶ τῆς ἐν χάριτι ζωῆς. | Ac xv. β'. ἐπανάληψις ὃν ὁ ἄγγελος κ.τ.λ. |
| xii. ἐπανάληψις περὶ τῆς ἀποκευμένης ἀγίους δόξης. | 2 Pe iv. ἐπανάληψις περὶ κακίας ἀνθρώπων αἰρετικῶν. |
| 1 Co v. περὶ διαφορᾶς ἐδεσμάτων καὶ ἀποχῆς δαιμονικοῦ σεβασμάτου. | 1 Jo vii. α'. ἐν φῷ περὶ ἀποχῆς δαιμονικοῦ σεβάσματος. |
| 2 Co ad init. καὶ περὶ τῆς μεταδοτικῆς ἀρετῆς. | Jas ii. καὶ πράξεως ἀγαθῆς μεταδοτικῆς. |
| vi. καὶ τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἀπόθεσεως καὶ ἐπαναλήψεως. | 1 Jo iv. καὶ διαθέσεως μεταδοτικῆς. |
| | 1 Pe v. περὶ ἀποθέσεως φαύλων πράξεων καὶ ἐπαναλήψεως τῶν ἐν πνεύματι καρπῶν. |

Eph i. περὶ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐκλογῆς ἡμῶν καὶ εἰσαγωγῆς καὶ τελειώσεως.	1 Pe viii. εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ τελειώσεως τῶν πιστευόντων.
Phil i. καὶ εὐχὴ τελειώσεως.	3 Jo i. εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ τελειώσεως κ.τ.λ.
2 Thes i. καὶ εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ τελειώσεως αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.	
1 Thes iii. περὶ ἀφίξεως τῆς αὐτοῦ.	Ac xxiv. καὶ ἀφίξεως Παύλου εἰς Μακεδονίαν.
vi. περὶ τοῦ αἰφνιδίως ἥξειν Χριστόν, ὅστε δεῖν εὐτρεπίζεσθαι σπουδῆ κ.τ.λ.	3 Jo iii. περὶ ἀφίξεως αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς.
	2 Pe iv. α'. ἐν φῶ ὅτι αἰφνιδίως ἥξει Χριστός... ὥστε δεῖν εὐτρεπίζεσθαι πάσῃ ἀρετῇ.

It is worth while to note also the occurrence in the chapter summaries of two somewhat striking words which Euthalius uses of himself: *συμπεριφορά*, Ro c. v. *α'* and *β'* (cf. Z. 405, 428); and *συμμετρία*, Jas c. iii. (cf. Z. 409 *ad fin.*).

It would seem then either that Euthalius must have based his later work most carefully upon the Pauline summaries which he had previously borrowed, or that his indebtedness to his unnamed predecessor cannot have been so great as his modesty would lead us to suppose.

Further Interpolations.

Some further insertions into the Euthalian apparatus, as found in Zacagni's Edition, may conveniently be noticed at this point.

On p. 425, after the 'Τπόθεσις of the Acts, we find a piece entitled 'Αποδημίαι Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. It commences 'Απὸ Δαμασκοῦ ἤρξατο and ends ὕστερον ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ 'Ρώμῃ ἐμαρτύρησεν. This is little more than a list of places visited by S. Paul. In Oecumenius (Morel *ut supra* I. 193) the same piece goes on further to speak of the Festival of S. Paul at Rome (cf. Z. 522 f.). No one will, I think, be disposed to claim this piece for Euthalius.

Again on pp. 513 f., at the close of the Catholic Epistles, we have three supplementary sections:

(1) A series of stichometrical calculations and a colophon

concerning the correction of the book in the Caesarean Library. Of this we shall speak further below (see p. 34).

(2) Ἐπίγραμμα τοῦ ἐν Ἀθήναις βωμοῦ, with a note upon it.

This Inscription is cited by Oecumenius on the Acts *ad loc.*

(3) Πλούς Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐπὶ Ῥώμην. 12 lines.

This is the 'Navigatio Pauli,' referred to already (pp. 5, 9). It is found in various positions in MSS: sometimes at the end of the Acts, and sometimes at the end of the Pauline Epistles. Here it is peculiarly out of place.

Critical Results of this Examination.

We have thus found reason to suspect the genuineness of a large portion of the materials which Zacagni has collected under the name of Euthalius. The Tables of ἀναγνώσεις, to which are appended the notes which are the sole ground for crediting Euthalius with stichometrical labours; the Short Tables of Quotations, with some minor lists attached to them; the Pseudo-Athanasiian *argumenta*; the second system of chapter numeration for the Acts; and the further interpolations just mentioned:—all these must be cleared away if we are to get a true conception of the original Edition of Euthalius.

What remains deserves to be carefully edited: but no edition will be complete which does not also give us the spurious matter, which is of considerable importance for the history of the Euthalian tradition and therefore, though indirectly, for the textual criticism of the Acts and Epistles.

We may probably accept as genuine:

(1) The three Prologues (Paul. Act. Cath.).

(2) The Full Tables of Quotations.

(3) The Chapter Summaries, with the little prefatory note prefixed to those of the Acts.

I have said nothing of the *Martyrium Pauli*, for that will require a separate consideration.

CHAPTER III.

THE DATE OF EUTHALIUS, AND TRACES OF HIS INFLUENCE.

The Martyrium Pauli.

THE *Martyrium Pauli*, which occurs in some Greek and some Armenian codices immediately after the Euthalian Prologue to the Pauline Epistles, plays so important a part in the controversy as to the date of Euthalius that it is necessary to subject it to a thorough examination. I am not aware that the genuineness of this little section, which stands by itself with a title of its own, *Μαρτύριον Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου*, has ever been seriously discussed. The dust raised by the controversy as to whether Euthalius is the author of the main portion of it which contains the earlier date, or of the added part which contains the later date, has blinded critics to the necessity of offering a reason for attributing to him any share in its composition at all.

Yet when we have read steadily through the whole of the Prologue, it is hard to understand why this little appendix should be given us: for Euthalius has already discussed at some length the chronology of S. Paul by the aid of the works of Eusebius. Moreover its absence from certain MSS, Greek and Armenian, is in itself suspicious. Zacagni, too, tells us that in his Codex Urbinas (=Ac 79 P 90 saec. xi.) it is found without the Euthalian Prologue, and called "Prologue to the fourteen Epistles of S. Paul."

A slight comparison of its phraseology with that of the Prologue disposes of Zacagni's view that it is the work of the 'early Father' from whom Euthalius borrowed his chapter-divisions for it is redolent of Euthalius: the only question is whether it is not too redolent.

Let us set side by side certain sentences of the Prologue and the whole of the *Martyrium*, excepting the added portion which contains the later date.

PROLOGUE TO PAULINE EPISTLES.

Z. 522 Λύτόθι οὖν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἀγωνισάμενος, ὡς φησιν αὐτός, τῷ τῶν Ἱερονίκων Χριστοῦ μαρτύρων στεφάνῳ κατεκομήθη. Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ περικαλλέστιν οἴκοις καὶ βασιλείοις τούτου λείψανα καθείρξαντες ἐπέτειον αὐτῷ μνήμης ἡμέραν πανηγυρίζουσι τῇ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίων, πέμπτη Πανέμονος μηνὸς, τούτου τὸ μαρτύριον ἑορτάζοντες.

Z. 532 "Ενθα δὴ συνέβη τὸν Παῦλον τριακοστῷ ἔκτῳ ἔτει τοῦ σωτῆρίου πάθους τρισκαιδεκάτῳ δὲ Νέρωνος μαρτυρῆσαι, ξίφει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτηθέντα.

Z. 533 Περὶ δὲ τῆς δευτέρας (ἀπολογίας), ἐν ᾧ καὶ τελειοῦται τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν μαρτυρίῳ, φησίν· κ.τ.λ.

"Εστιν οὖν ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τοῦ κηρύγματος Παύλου κ.τ.λ.

Z. 529 Ἀναγκαῖον δὲ ἡγησάμην ἐν βραχεῖ καὶ τὸν χρόνον ἐπισημειώσασθαι τὸν κηρύγματος Παύλου, ἐκ τῶν χρονικῶν κανόνων Εὐσέβιον τοῦ Παμφίλου τὴν ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν ποιούμενος.

Μαρτύριον Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου.

'Ἐπὶ Νέρωνος τοῦ Καίσαρος Ῥωμαίων ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτόθι Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος, ξίφει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτημηθεὶς ἐν τῷ τριακοστῷ καὶ ἔκτῳ ἔτει τοῦ σωτῆρίου πάθους, τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἀγωνισάμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ, πέμπτη ἡμέρᾳ Πανέμονος μηνὸς, ἦτις λέγοιτο ἀν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἡ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίων, καθ' ἣν ἐτελειώθη ὁ ἄγιος ἀπόστολος τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν μαρτυρίῳ, ἐξηκοστῷ καὶ ἐννάτῳ ἔτει τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ παρονοσίας.

"Ἐστιν οὖν ὁ πᾶς χρόνος ἐξ οὐ ἐμαρτύρησε τριακόσια τριάκοντα ἔτη μέχρι τῆς παρούσης ταύτης ὑπατείας, τετάρτης μὲν Ἀρκαδίου τρίτης δὲ Ὁνωρίου τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν αὐτοκρατόρων Αὐγούστων, ἐννάτης ἵνδικτῶν τῆς πεντεκαιδεκαεπηρικῆς περιώδους, μηνὸς Ἰουνίου εἰκοστῇ ἐννάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

'Ἐσημειωσάμην ἀκριβῶς τὸν χρόνον τοῦ μαρτυρίου Παύλου ἀποστόλου.

[For the additional note, see p. 47.]

The passages which I have quoted from the Prologue do not practically stand so far apart as the pages of Zacagni's edition suggest; for pp. 523—528 contain brief summaries of the Pauline Epistles, and pp. 529—532 a discussion of the chronology based on Eusebius: to an epitomiser they would lie sufficiently near together.

It is almost inconceivable that a writer who has so great a wealth of expression as the author of the Prologue should repeat his own language in this slavish manner. Nor on the other hand does it seem in the least probable that the *Martyrium* has been

used at considerable intervals (for the intervals are considerable on this view) in the composition of the Prologue.

Beside these general considerations there are three distinct points at which the *Martyrium* shews itself to be the later document.

1. At first where, *ex hypothesi*, the writer embodies a phrase of the Prologue he gives the Roman date for June 29, viz. ἦ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίων; but lower down we find μηνὸς Ἰουνίου εἰκοστῆ ἐννάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

2. The phrase in the *Martyrium* τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν μαρτυρίῳ is, to say the least, extremely harsh; whether we refer αὐτὸν to S. Paul, or to Nero, who has not been mentioned since the first line of the piece. But in the Prologue, after quoting with reference to the first ἀπολογία, "I was delivered from the mouth of the lion," the writer continues: τοῦτον τὸν Νέρωνα εἶναι λέγων. περὶ δὲ τῆς δευτέρας (ἀπολογίας), ἐν ᾧ καὶ τελειοῦται τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν μαρτυρίῳ, φησίν· κ.τ.λ.: so that αὐτὸν here clearly refers to Nero.

3. But a more striking divergence remains to be noticed. The author of the *Martyrium* places the martyrdom itself on June 29. But this was a later deduction from the fact that the Roman Church kept the festival of SS. Peter and Paul on that day, which we know from the Liberian Catalogue (A.D. 354) to have been simply the day of the Deposition in A.D. 258 (see Lightfoot, *Clem. Rom.* 1890, vol. II. pp. 499 ff.). The mistake was common, if not universal, in later times; but it is not made by the writer of the Prologue.

The result of this investigation is somewhat surprising. Neither 458 nor 396 can any longer be considered the date of Euthalius. We must take him back earlier still. We must allow time for the recognition of the value of his work, and the modification of it by an epitomiser who desired perhaps to produce an *editio minor* by the abbreviation of the prefatory matter.

Other indications of date.

We thus start afresh to look for the date of Euthalius's work at some period anterior to A.D. 396. An upper limit is given us by his reference to Eusebius (Z. 529). For he tells us that his

summary of the chronology of S. Paul's life is based upon that writer: ἐκ τῶν χρονικῶν κανόνων Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου τὴν ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν ποιούμενος. In a later passage he embodies *verbatim* the language of Eus. *H. E.* II. 24: καὶ φησι τὸν Παῦλον ἀνέτον διατρίψαι...λόγος ἔχει διαστείλασθαι κ.τ.λ. (Z. 531 ff.). Accordingly the work of Euthalius must be subsequent to A.D. 323.

The name of the Father (*πάτερ τιμιώτατε*, Z. 515) to whom the Edition of the Pauline Epistles was dedicated is not given us: but the Edition of the Acts and Catholic Epistles is dedicated to an Athanasius, who is addressed as ἀδελφὲ Ἀθανάσιε προσφιλέστατε (Z. 409) and ἀδελφὲ Ἀθανάσιε τιμιώτατε (Z. 476). The titles of the Prologues to the Acts and the Catholic Epistles vary considerably in the MSS; so that I lay no stress on the words *πρὸς Ἀθανάσιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἀλεξανδρείας*, which there occur. The tradition, however, which they represent is quite likely to be a true one; and now that the second Athanasius, to whom Zacagni and others have assigned the reference, is out of the question, I see no ground for denying that it was at the request of the great Athanasius that this part of the work of Euthalius was undertaken.

It is however due to the clever suggestion of Dr Rendel Harris, to which allusion has been made above (pp. 7 f.), that the grounds on which it is based should be seriously examined. It will be remembered that the constant recurrence of the word *μελέτη* in the Prologue to the Acts led Dr Harris to conjecture that the work was really dedicated to some one of the name of Meletius, and that this name on account of its many heretical associations was afterwards replaced by a name whose orthodoxy was above suspicion. Dr Harris has himself observed that the Prologue begins with words which might be used to weaken the force of his argument: "Οσοι τῆς ὄντως πάνυ πως ἀγχιθέους καὶ θεοφιλοὺς ἀθανασίας εἰσὶν ἐρασταῖ, κ.τ.λ....εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν ἀθανασίαν βλέποντιν (Z. 403 f.). This possible allusion to the name of Athanasius is, however, to his mind entirely overshadowed by a still clearer allusion to the name of Meletius in another passage (Z. 406). But it will be best to give his own words (*Stichometry*, pp. 80 f.):

"And now there follows in the prologue an address to the person to whom the book is dedicated, which is so important for the understanding of it, that I must transcribe a complete sentence :

έγώ δὲ δικαιώτατα, καὶ μάλα γε ὄρθως σύντροφόν τε καὶ φίλην ἐπιφημίσαιμ' ἄν σοι, καὶ καταλέξω τὴν εὐπροσήγορον, τὴν πάνυ φερώνυμον, τὴν τῶν θείων λογίων ἐμφιλόσοφόν φημι μελέτην, ὡφ' ἣν γεγώνως (l. γεγονώς) φιλόχριστε, καὶ εἴσω γέ τοι τῶν δικτύων αὐτῆς ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν ἔρασμιον αὐτῆς προσηγορίαν ἐγκαταπραγματευόμενος, συχναῖς τε ἀεὶ καὶ ἀκοιμήτοις γυμνασίαις ἀκουόμενος (l. ἀσκούμενος) εὐθαλεστάτην κατέστησας.

"The sense of which passage is as follows, after some obvious corrections have been made :

'With great justice and accuracy I might assign her to thee as thy foster-sister and darling, and I will describe her as the fairly-entitled, the appropriately-named¹, the one skilled in the knowledge of the divine oracles, her, I mean, Mistress Study (*μελέτη*), under whose power thou hast come, and verily she hath thee in the net; while thou, busied in the acquisition of so delightful an appellation, and trained ever in persistent and sleepless discipline, hast rendered her flourishing indeed.'

"The key-word to the understanding of this passage is the word *μελέτη*. If we had any doubt on the point the sentences which succeed would settle the question; for the writer goes on to remark that even the poets had sung her praises....

"Now it is clear from this that the writer is playing with the word *μελέτη*; and he has personified her and made her into a fair bride for the good father to whom he writes. But why should he say of her that she is his foster-sister, ay! and his namesake?"

After discussing a passage from the Prologue to the Pauline Epistles (Z. 529), where he proposes to read with Boecler's codex (but against the main tradition) *πάνν φερώνυμον* for *αὐτοφερώνυμον*, he goes on (p. 82) :

"It is reasonable then to assume that in the previous passage he is playing on the word *μελέτη*.

¹ Or possibly : *the very namesake*.

"But this can hardly be the case unless the discourse were addressed not to Athanasius, but to some one of the name of Meletius.

"Make this supposition and all is clear: Melete (Study) is your foster-sister, bride, and namesake; caught in her toils, you, Meletius, have made her renowned."

I know how difficult it is to do justice to an argument of this kind by giving extracts only; but I hope that Dr Harris's book will be in the hands of most of my readers, and I must ask them to consider his view as a whole before they give a judgment upon it. Yet I cannot help feeling that the passage cited above is capable of a different interpretation.

His former book, he says, was drawn from him by the commands of a father; this is the offspring of brotherly goodwill, and it must meet with the indulgence of brotherly charity. After some praise of charity, he continues:

'And for me it is most just and right that I should dedicate to thee a foster-sister and a friend of mine; and I will describe her as the maiden well-entitled¹, wholly true to name, Study (*μελέτη*), I mean, that is devoted to the Scriptures: under whose spell thou hast come, thou friend of Christ, and in whose nets thou art already caught, and whose delightsome title thou dost strive to make thine own; and training thyself in her ever constant and sleepless exercises thou hast made her flourishing indeed.'

The epithet 'true to name' plays upon the familiar sense of *μελέτη*, which is commonly used of 'training' or 'practice' for the games. 'Study,' indeed, is a derived sense of the word *μελέτη*, and the athletic metaphor is quite naturally worked out in the final clause².

¹ This unusual sense of *εὐπροσήγορος* (generally = 'easy of address,' 'affable') seems to be justified by the context, and to be explained and reinforced in *τὴν πάνυ φερώνυμον*. Cf. Eus. *H. E.* v. 24. 18 ὁ μὲν Εἰρηναῖος φερώνυμός τις ὡν τῇ προσηγορίᾳ αὐτῷ τε τῷ τρόπῳ εἰρηνοποιός. Otherwise we might render: "the maid of winsome converse...whose delightsome converse thou dost make the business of thy life."

² I prefer this interpretation, as more simple, to another offered to me by a friend who supposes a play upon *μέλιττα*, 'the veritable Bee of industry.' To the same friend I am indebted for the suggestion that *σύντροφον* must mean 'one who has been brought up with' Euthalius, and not '*thy* foster-sister': *ἐγώ* and *σοι* are both in emphatic positions in the sentence.

If we are to see a play upon names in *εὐθαλεστάτην*, as Dr Harris has suggested, I think that the meaning must be: 'Thou hast made the foster-sister of Euthalius *εὐθαλεστάτη*'.

As far as dates are concerned, Dr Harris may, if he accepts my criticism of the *Martyrium*, choose Meletius of Antioch instead of Meletius of Mopsuestia; but I cannot myself think that a case is made out for any early deletion of the name Meletius at all.

If we allow the name Athanasius to stand, it is of course possible that some other person of that name may be intended, and not the great bishop of Alexandria. Yet it cannot be denied that, if our view of the *Martyrium Pauli* be correct, there is no chronological difficulty to make us distrust the tradition contained in the titles of the two Prologues in question. It is to the titles alone that we are indebted for the preservation of the name of Euthalius himself, and the mystery which shrouds his episcopal see—*Εὐθάλιος ἐπίσκοπος Σούλκης*—is an argument rather for the genuineness of the description than the reverse. That Euthalius should address him as *ἀδελφός*, and again with the exclamation *ὦ φίλη μοι κεφαλή* (Z. 476), is natural enough if he were his brother bishop¹.

The Library at Caesarea.

Zacagni, on p. lxv of his Introduction, declares that Euthalius visited Caesarea in Palestine for the purpose of collating the text of the Acts and Catholic Epistles with the famous codices of the library of Eusebius and Pamphilus. This statement is based on a colophon which follows some stichometrical calculations at the end of the Epistle of S. Jude (Z. 513). These calculations, like others which we have already seen reason to dismiss, have no claim to be Euthalian. The scribe gives the number of the *stichi* for the *προοίμια* of the Acts and of the Catholic Epistles,

¹ It is interesting to note that somewhere about the year 340 the Emperor Constans had requested Athanasius to prepare for him certain copies of the Scriptures: see the *Apologia ad Constantium*, 4: *τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου οὐκ ἔγραψα, ἢ μόνον ὅτε... καὶ ὅτε, πυκτὰ τῶν θείων γραφῶν κελεύσαντος αὐτοῦ μοι κατασκενάσαι, ταῦτα ποιήσας ἀπέστειλα.*

and the *stichi* for the text of these as well, and then adds, before giving the total for the codex,

καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν στίχοι κεῖ.

It is plain enough that *ἐμαυτὸν* cannot here be referred to the author of the *προοίμια*.

After this follows :

'Αντεβλήθη δὲ τῶν πράξεων καὶ καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν τὸ βιβλίον πρὸς τὰ ἀκριβῆ ἀντίγραφα τῶν ἐν Καισαρείᾳ βιβλιοθήκης Εὐσέβiou τοῦ Παμφίλou.

The most natural conclusion to draw from this is that a Euthalian text has in the first instance been copied from, and that the codex thus produced has afterwards been corrected by a MS in the Caesarean Library.

The colophon of the Pauline Epistles found in Cod. H and in Cod. Neap., and also in some Armenian MSS (see above, pp. 3, 8), gives us an exactly similar history for the remaining portion of the Euthalian Edition. But there is no ground at all, so far as these colophons are concerned, for taking Euthalius himself to Caesarea.

The connection with Caesarea thus established for a later stage of the Euthalian Edition makes it necessary to sound a note of warning as regards what is sometimes spoken of as 'the Euthalian text.' Our knowledge of Euthalian MSS is not yet sufficient to allow us to say, whether any existing codices preserve the actual text upon which Euthalius worked; or whether all of them are descended from copies which were corrected at Caesarea, and accordingly present us with a 'mixed text.' In the present state of criticism we must avoid speaking of 'the Euthalian text' at all. Tischendorf denotes in his *apparatus* by Euthal^{cod} the upper writing of the palimpsest Codex Porfirianus. This, it is true, gives us a 14th century copy of the Euthalian Edition; but exactly what stage of the Euthalian tradition is represented in it, is not to be learnt from Tischendorf's scanty description. In his *Monumenta Sacra Inedita*, vol. v. p. xii, he tells us that the first leaf begins with *καὶ αὐτὸς μετὰ βαρνάβᾳ*. These words we find in the middle of the *ὑπόθεσις* of the Acts (Z. 423): so that clearly some non-Euthalian matter is in the

codex. He adds: ‘nec igitur nisi unum folium periit’: but apparently he has forgotten the Prologue to the Acts. Of the text of this codex he says: ‘quum et ipse tanta plerumque bonitate utatur ut revera ex Euthalii opera fluxisse videatur’—it shall be given in his next volume. This promise was never fulfilled, and we can attach no importance at all to his guess that this MS fairly represents the text of Euthalius himself. The date of this upper writing is (f. 319 v) *σωθ'*, i.e. 6809 = A.D. 1301.

A Euthalian codex, then, containing possibly an Alexandrian text—if indeed Euthalius was a deacon of Alexandria before he became bishop of Sulca—was brought to Caesarea, and there corrected by MSS in the great library: the MS used to correct the Pauline Epistles being one written by the hand of Pamphilus himself.

Of this Caesarean stage we shall find further traces presently. Here we may note that Hesychius, the presbyter of Jerusalem, who died about A.D. 438, in his *Στιχηρὸν τῶν ιβ' προφητῶν*, says: ἔστι μὲν ἀρχαῖον τοῦτο τοῖς θεοφόροις τὸ σπούδασμα στιχηδὸν ως τὰ πολλὰ πρὸς τὴν τῶν μελετωμένων σαφήνειαν τὰς προφητείας ἐκτίθεσθαι.....πλὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν βίβλον οὕτω τινὶ συγγραφεῖσαν εὑρὼν, οὐ μάτην ἐν ταῖς δυόδεκα βίβλοις τῶν προφητῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἡκολούθησα (*Adriani Isagoge, Critici Sacri tom. vi. p. 10*). Thus we apparently find a knowledge of the Euthalian Edition of the Pauline Epistles in Palestine in the early part of the fifth century.

Chapters of the Acts in Codd. Ξ and B.

If Caesarea be the ancestral home of the great Vatican Codex (B), we have no reason to be surprised that a copy of the Euthalian Edition of the Acts which was corrected in the Caesarean library should add to the Euthalian system of chapters the ancient chapter-numbers which an early hand, if not the original scribe or the *diorthotes*, has written in the margin of that codex (see above, p. 24). What if it shall prove to be the case that the relation of the Caesarean library to the Euthalian tradition is not that of giver only, but of receiver in its turn?

There is a second system of chapter-numbers for the Acts in

Cod. B. It is by a later hand than the first, but still by a very early hand. It reckons 69 chapters in all. The same system is found in the margin of Cod. Σ; and here again it is the work of a very early hand¹. Plate VIII. of the *facsimile* edition of Σ shews us that this same extremely fine hand has also added brief *lemmata*, e.g. τὰ περὶ τοῦ Πέτρου (in the upper margin): and in the left-hand margin against Ac ii. 34 we have ψαλμω ρθ, indicating a quotation from Ps cix. (ex.). The numeration in Σ breaks off after reaching \overline{MB} (Ac xv. 40); and Tischendorf points out that the next folio (110) of the ms begins a new quaternion. Can it be that the numbers were written in before the codex was bound, and that for some reason the scribe became discontented with his task and broke it off at the end of a gathering of leaves?

Where did this system of numbers, common to Σ and B, come from? The two codices have got hold of it quite independently of one another. It cannot have been copied from B into Σ, for Σ has one number (\overline{m}) which is not found in B: nor can it have been copied from Σ into B, for nearly a third of the numbers (from \overline{MB} onwards) are not found in Σ. We must go back to a common source—some ms which gave its numeration to them both: and this seems to imply that the Σ and B were at an early stage of their history lying side by side in the same library.

But still we have got no nearer to the origin of the system itself. How did this division into 69 chapters originate?

If we think of the Euthalian chapters, they are 40 in number. If we add to them the subdivisions, these are 48; and so we have a total of 88 sections in all, and we seem as far off from a solution as before.

It will be remembered, however, that there seemed good reason for supposing that the Euthalian subdivisions were in the first instance denoted merely by asterisks, and that these asterisks were very liable to drop out in the process of copying.

Let us suppose now that a scribe, with the Euthalian chapters and subdivisions before him, chose to adopt a new method of enumeration, and to number continuously through chapters and subdivisions; reckoning, that is to say, the subdivisions as if they

¹ See Tisch. *Nov. Test. Sinait.*, Leipzig, 1863, p. xxiv.

were main divisions¹. This process ought to yield for the Acts a total of 88 divisions. But if the calculator, through his own carelessness or owing to the neglect of some earlier scribe, missed some of the asterisks (or, indeed, of the letters, if these be considered the earlier form of the notation) which marked the subdivisions, we should have as the result a system of divisions which recognised all the Euthalian chapters, but not all the Euthalian subdivisions, and ran in one continuous series from the beginning to the end of the Acts.

Is it possible that this is the explanation of the numeration common to **N** and **B**? In order to satisfy ourselves that it is, we shall expect to find that all the main chapters of Euthalius are duly represented, though several of the subdivisions have disappeared. The matter is of sufficient interest to justify a tabulation of the two systems.

I take the Euthalian system from Zacagni (428 ff.) and from a MS in the British Museum (Add. 28,816: A.D. 1111), recording all important variants. Neither of these authorities locates the subdivisions with completeness. Several times Zacagni can only conjecture the point at which the subdivision begins; presumably because his codex had missed the number in its margin. The British Museum codex only undertakes to give $\mu\epsilon'$ (and this is the number promised likewise in the MS at Christ Church, Oxford, *Wake* 38, cent. xi.); and, as a matter of fact, although it numbers the subdivisions continuously throughout the book in red (as opposed to the numbers of the main chapters which are in black), it yet drops by sheer carelessness no less than seven of them, viz. β , γ , ς , $\iota\delta$, $\kappa\gamma$, $\kappa\eta$ and $\lambda\beta$. It has also dropped one main chapter (i). So that a scribe, numbering chapters and subdivisions as one series from this MS, would only reach a total of 77. This will shew how easily, even in spite of the protection afforded by continuous numeration by letters, subdivisions might altogether disappear.

¹ We have seen an actual instance of this reckoning for the Epistle to the Romans: see above, p. 24.

Euth.	B	N			Euth.	B	N		
Acts i 1 15 23 ii 1 14 17 22 37 42 ¹	A B Γ Δ E Σ Ζ H Θ I α β γ δ ε Δ α β γ ε Δ α β γ Σ α β γ Ι α β γ Θ α β γ I α β γ Ζ α β γ H α β γ				viii 5 9 14 18 20 26 ⁶ ix 1 17 32 36 ⁷ x 1 23 ⁸ 30 34 xi 4 19 27 xii 1 3 18 xiii 1 ⁹ 16 33 ¹⁰				
	A B				vii 5 9 14 18 20 26 ⁶ ix 1 17 32 36 ⁷ x 1 23 ⁸ 30 34 xi 4 19 27 xii 1 3 18 xiii 1 ⁹ 16 33 ¹⁰				
					viii 5 9 14 18 20 26 ⁶ ix 1 17 32 36 ⁷ x 1 23 ⁸ 30 34 xi 4 19 27 xii 1 3 18 xiii 1 ⁹ 16 33 ¹⁰				
					vii 5 9 14 18 20 26 ⁶ ix 1 17 32 36 ⁷ x 1 23 ⁸ 30 34 xi 4 19 27 xii 1 3 18 xiii 1 ⁹ 16 33 ¹⁰				

We may summarise the evidence of the preceding table thus:

Chapters of Euthalius exactly represented in N or B	. .	28
" " represented within a verse	. .	5
" " with further displacement	. .	5
		—
		38

Only two of the Euthalian chapters are thus unaccounted for, viz. κθ and μ. But κθ is missing only through the carelessness of the scribe who wrote the numbers into **B**: he has forgotten to write νβ between his να and his νγ. And μ is the last chapter of all, and **B** is not alone in this omission; it is dropped also as we have seen (above, p. 22) in the interesting codex, Coislin. xxv.

As to the displaced numbers, those which vary only by a single verse need give us no anxiety. A glance at any MS which contains lection-marks will shew that often these fall where the chapter-numbering should be, and cause it in consequence to be written a verse too soon or a verse too late.

Of the more serious displacements it is worth noting that two of them (viz. σ and κ) coincide with numbers belonging to another system which is also common in MSS, being found in **B. M. Add. 28,816** and in **w^{scr}** (Trin. Coll. Camb. B 10 16) and many others.

Passing to the subdivisions we find as follows:

Subdivisions of Euthalius exactly represented in N or B	. .	20
" " within a verse	. .	3
" " with further displacement	. .	8
		—
		31

Of the 8 displaced subdivisions, two coincide with lection numbers of another system. Of the 17 that are dropped—if we take as our standard the 48 of Zacagni's edition—6 are cases where a chapter has but one subdivision; and 6 more either were dropped by carelessness in **B. M. Add. 28,816**, or never were intended to be given.

I find it accordingly hard to resist the conclusion that the system of chapter-numbers in the Acts which is common to **N** and **B** is derived from the system of Euthalius by numbering con-

tinuously through main chapters and subdivisions, allowance being made for the accidental (or, conceivably, intentional) omission of a certain number of the subdivisions. It may indeed be said that all intelligent systems of division into chapters must coincide to a large extent, because there are many natural breaks which must be recognised. I admit the force of this; but I feel that the coincidence which we have traced is not sufficiently accounted for in this way. There is another system, which I have already referred to in passing, which is found in many MSS, and which divides the Acts into 53 chapters: but at least 25 of these do not correspond within a verse with any of the 88 Euthalian chapters or subdivisions. And on the other hand it is to be noticed that we find divisions in Euthalius and in the system of **NB** at curious points, where we should perhaps scarcely have expected that a break would be made. We may give as instances of these: vii. 11, x. 30, xii. 18, xv. 23, xxii. 12 and xxiii. 22. The strangeness of these breaks is diminished when we observe that in Euthalius they mark only subdivisions, and not main chapters.

If the identification be a true one it is not without importance in connection with the history of **N** and **B**.

The system which we have been endeavouring to account for occurs also, with some variations, in Codex Amiatinus and Codex Fuldensis; and this fact was one of several indications which inclined Dr Hort to look for the birthplace of **N** and **B** somewhere in the West. For hitherto this numeration had seemed to be absolutely unique in the Greek world. Dr Hort's words are (*Introd.* p. 266): "Again it is remarkable that the principal Latin system of division of the Acts, found in the *Codex Amiatinus* and, slightly modified, in other Vulgate MSS, is indicated by Greek numerals both in **N** (with large irregular omissions) and in **B**, but is otherwise unknown in Greek MSS and literature. The numerals were apparently inserted in both MSS, certainly in **N**, by very ancient scribes, though not by the writers of the text itself, **B** indeed having antecedently a wholly different set of numerals. The differences in detail are sufficient to shew that the two scribes followed different originals: the differences of both from the existing Latin arrangement are still greater, but too slight to allow any doubt as to identity of ultimate origin. The coincidence suggests a presumption that the

early home, and therefore not improbably the birthplace, of both MSS was in the West."

Codex Amiatinus has 70 divisions and Codex Fuldensis 74. This is sufficiently near to the 69 of Codex B. It is interesting to note that in 3 places (vii. 55 [54], xvi. 16, xviii. 24) where numbers are wanting in **NB**, they are found in *Am. Fu.* Also in three cases of displacement (ii. 1, ii. 37, vi. 8) *Am. Fu.* side with Euthalius against **NB**. These facts are confirmatory of the view that the system found in Euthalius is the ultimate source¹.

Whether the occurrence in the most important MSS of the Latin Vulgate of a chapter-numeration of the Acts which is Euthalian in its ultimate origin can be made to throw any light on the problem of Greek MSS used by S. Jerome in this part of his New Testament, is a question that I can only propose at this point, in the hope that it may receive the attention of the Oxford editors, who have promised us a dissertation 'De codicibus graecis quibus Hieronymus usus fuerit.' Here again, at any rate, the moving back of the date of Euthalius has opened up a fresh possibility.

Whether this Euthalian system was invented by Euthalius, or only adopted by him, may possibly be questioned. But it is quite clear that his system of chapters and subdivisions could not be derived from a longer system of chapters only. And now that we have pushed the date of Euthalius further back, there is no chronological difficulty in supposing him to have been the inventor of the system which he employs.

The locality of Euthalius.

The locality to which Euthalius belonged is a further problem which still resists solution. He is described as ἐπίσκοπος Σούλκης, but his see has not been identified. Sulci in Sardinia has seemed to be out of the question, and the various suggestions of Zacagni (pref. lxiv) have but little to be urged in their favour. The fact that he addresses himself to S. Athanasius naturally inclines us to look to the neighbourhood of Alexandria: but on so slight an indication we cannot lay much stress.

¹ Another series, of 68 cc., is given by Thomasius (*Opp. i. 353 ff.*). This also seems Euthalian. Its last no. is at *Ac xxviii. 17* (against *B am fu corb₂*). See further Berger, *Hist. de la Vulg.* p. 356.

There is a passage in the Prologue to the Pauline Epistles, which, if we could be confident as to the true text, might be taken as pointing to Syria—perhaps to Caesarea or to Antioch. In speaking of the Roman festival of S. Paul's martyrdom, Euthalius, according to the text of Zacagni (p. 523), equates the Roman date *a. d. III. kal. Iul.* with the fifth day of Panemus, a Syro-macedonian month. But from some MSS this reference to Panemus is absent, while in others Lous takes its place, and in others again we have a combination of the two in a corrupt form.

I give here the evidence for the variants so far as I have happened to come across it. Apart from our present purpose it may be of service as a guide for the future classification of Euthalian MSS.

Z. 523. ‘Ρωμαῖοι.....ἐπέτειον αὐτῷ μνήμης ἡμέραν πανηγυρίζουσι, τῇ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν Ἰουλίων, πέμπτη Πανέμου μηνός, τούτου τὸ μαρτύριον ἑορτάζουσες.

1. *πέμπτη Πανέμου μηνός.*

Vat Reg Gr 179 (Zac.) s. xi

Par Coisl 224 s. xi

Par Arm 9 (gr et arm) s. xi

2. om. *πέμπτη Πανέμου μηνός.*

Vat Gr 761 (Zac.) s. xii (comm. Oecum.)

Chelt 1461 (Dob.) s. xiv/xv

Oecum ed Morel (Paris 1630) i p. 193

3. (a) *ἐκτῷ τῷ Λώῳ μηνί.*

Bas AN iv 2 (Dob.) s. x

Vat Gr 1761 ('Lollinian.' Zac.) s. xi

(b) *ἐκτῷ τῷ ὅλων μηνί.*

Bas AN iii 11 (Dob.) s. xi

Bas AN iv 4 (Dob.) s. xii

Par Gr 101 (Dob.) s. xiii

(c) *ηρ ορ φεγ ή νοομῆν αμάνη ηρ ή μαρερή.*

'which is the 6th day of the month Noomon, which is Mareri.'

Arm ed Zohrab p. 764

4. *πέμπτη Πανέμου μηνός, ἐκτῷ τῶν νόμων μηνί.*

Vat Reg 29 (Boecler) s. xi

Par Gr 105 s. x (fragm.)

B M Add 28,816. A.D. 1111. (*τοῦ Παν.*)

Oxf Ch Ch Wake 38 s. xi (*τοῦ Παν.*)

Ibid. Wake 12 s. xi (*τοῦ Παν....νονων*)

The evidence for (2), the shortest reading of all, is not strong in itself: for Vat. Gr. 761 omits all the words from $\pi\acute{e}μπτη$ to $\acute{e}σορτάζοντες$: and though Oecumenius does not do this, yet it is plain that he has been abbreviating in the immediate context. Of Chelt. 1461 I can give no further information.

Such strength as it has is chiefly to be derived from the rivalry of the variants. But on the other hand we may observe, as against (2) and (3) and in favour of (1), that Panemus, and not Lous, is found in the *Martyrium Pauli*, which, as we have seen, was compiled out of Euthalian phrases in the year 396.

It is possible that both Panemus and Lous have come in as marginal glosses¹. We shall see presently that the Egyptian month Epiphi came in thus into the text of the *Martyrium Pauli*. If this be the true account, Panemus might point to an early time when a copy of the Euthalian Edition lay in the library of Caesarea.

The reading which gives us Lous has suffered badly at the hands of ignorant copyists. Even in the form (3 a) $\acute{e}κτω \tauῶ Λώφ μηνί$, it is obviously corrupt. Lous was not spoken of as the sixth month anywhere, so far as we know. But the 6th day of Lous would be the equivalent in Asia Minor to the 5th day of Panemus in Syria. This seems to be established by Cardinal Noris quite independently of this passage, in which he knew only the reading $\pi\acute{e}μπτη Πανέμου μηνός$. In the first of his Dissertations *De Annis et Epochis Syromacedonum* (Florence, 1691), pp. 19, 36 f., he shews that the Syro-macedonians began *Panemus* on the 25th of June, while the Asiatic Macedonians began *Lous* on the 24th of June.

Lous then may be a correction of Panemus, which has sometimes supplanted it and sometimes crept in beside it. In any case it points to Asia Minor as another resting-place of the Euthalian Edition.

We may hope that, when Euthalius comes to be critically edited, sufficient evidence may be forthcoming to tell us decisively whether the reference to Panemus belongs to him or to his

¹ This view is taken by v. Dobschütz, *Centr. f. Bibl.* x. 67 f., who however inclines to 458 as the date of Euthalius.

copyists. Meanwhile we cannot safely argue from the passage in question as to the locality in which Euthalius lived and worked.

In the corresponding passage in the *Martyrium Pauli* (see above, p. 29), there is likewise a considerable variety of reading:

1. πέμπτη ἡμέρᾳ Πανέμου μηνός· ἦτις λέγοιτ' ἀν παρὰ 'Ρωμαίοις ἡ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν 'Ιουλίων.

Vat Reg 29 (Boecler) s. xi	Bas AN iv 5 (Dob.) s. xv/xvi
Vat Pal 38 (Zac.) s. xi/xii	Bas AN iii 11 (Dob.) s. xi
Par Arm 9 (gr et arm)	Oxf Ch Ch Wake 38 s. xi
B M Add 28,816. A.D. 1111.	<i>Ibid.</i> Wake 12 s. xi
Berol Gr quart. 57 (Dob.) s. xiii	Par Coisl 28. A.D. 1056
Berol Gr quart. 43 (Dob.) s. xiv	Par Coisl 30 s. xi
Neap II A 7 (Dob.) s. xii	Oecum ed Morel i p. 195

[Of these the last seven end the *Mart.* with *παροντιάς*: the last four also read τῇ for ἡ: the last reads λέγεται for λέγοιτ' ἀν.]

This form of reading has the support of Arm zohr, which however adds a clause after 'Ιουλίων introducing an Armenian month.

2. πέμπτη ἡμέρᾳ Πανέμου μηνός· ἦτις λέγοιτ' ἀν παρὰ 'Ρωμαίοις, κατ' Αἰγυπτίοις 'Επιφὶ ε', ἡ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν 'Ιουλίων.

Vat Urbin 3 (Zac.) s. xi
Vat Gr 363 (Zac.) s. xi
Vat Reg Gr 179 (Zac.) s. xi
Vat Gr 1650 ('Cryptoferat.' Zac.) A.D. 1037

3. πέμπτη ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ Συρομακεδόνας Πανέμου μηνός· ἦτις λέγοιτο ἀν παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις 'Επιφὶ, παρὰ δὲ 'Ρωμαίοις ἡ πρὸ τριῶν καλανδῶν 'Ιουλίων.

Vat Gr 367 (Zac.) s. xi
Vat Gr 1761 ('Lollinian.' Zac.) s. xi
Bas AN iv 4 (Dob.) s. x
Oecum ed Morel i pref (reading ὅστις, and adding after 'Ιουλίων the words μηνὶ 'Ιουνίῳ κθ').

Of these three readings (1) is clearly the earliest. Obviously κατ' Αἰγυπτίοις 'Επιφὶ ε' was placed in the margin as a gloss upon παρὰ 'Ρωμαίοις κ.τ.λ. In (2) this gloss was unintelligently inserted without any change of the context. In (3) it was worked in more skilfully (though with the omission of the day of the month) by a reviser who also inserted κατὰ Συρομακεδόνας, and made the sentence run smoothly.

It may be noted that it was in the last three of the four MSS which support (2), that Zacagni found the additional note at the end of the *Martyrium*, giving the second date A.D. 458. It did

not directly concern us when we were discussing the origin of the *Martyrium*, and therefore I omitted it on p. 29. But for the sake of completeness it may be added here. I have not myself met with it in any MS, and so I simply reprint it from Zacagni (p. 537).

καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπατίας τετάρτης μὲν Ἀρκαδίου τρίτης δὲ Ὁνωρίου, μέχρι τῆς παρούσης ταύτης ὑπατίας, πρώτης Λέοντος Αὐγούστου, ἵνδικτιῶνος δωδεκάτης, Ἐπιφίλι ε', Διοκλετιανοῦ ροδ', ἔτη ἔγ. ὡς εἶναι τὰ πάντα ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἥμῶν παρουσίας μέχρι τοῦ προκειμένου ἔτους ἔτη τετρακόσια ἔξήκοντα δύο.

It is to be observed that the scribe gives us only the Egyptian month.

CHAPTER IV.

NOTES ON CODEX H OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

Recovery of the text of some pages now lost.

A LATER hand has covered over the letters of Codex H with a thick coating of dark ink which has completely hidden their original form. This ink is of a corrosive nature, and has eaten its way in places quite through the vellum of the codex. Indeed its ravages are being still continued: for a comparison of M. Omont's first facsimile with its original shews that in the last six years some of the holes have become perceptibly larger. It is much to be hoped that the authorities of the Bibliothèque Nationale will in the interest of scholarship cause the whole of their portion of the codex to be photographed without further delay, as otherwise there is danger lest many of the letters may be irreparably lost.

But this ink had another quality, more deserving of our gratitude. It has left a yellow stain on the opposite leaf, and in some places the letters thus reproduced are easily legible. M. Omont, on p. 56 of his edition, has given us a whole page of the text, which he has read backwards on the photograph of a page now at S. Petersburg. I had not observed this, when I myself began the attempt to recover lost leaves in the same manner. It was some satisfaction to find on comparing my transcript of this leaf with M. Omont's that we agreed in every letter and even in our inability to decipher the seven letters which he has printed in minuscules.

I give here sixteen pages, which I have thus been able to recover with more or less completeness. Some fragmentary portions of other pages may perhaps be capable of decipherment: but in several cases the writing from the other side of the vellum

shews through so distinctly as to be exceedingly confusing. Moreover in some instances in which the yellow stain is legible we actually possess the page from which it has come off: an example of this is given by M. Omont's first facsimile, where in the blank space after $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ in l. 12 the word $\epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\sigma\tau\alpha$ (1 Tim. ii. 8) can be very distinctly read: and the whole of the page in which this word occurs is still preserved and is transcribed on p. 46 of M. Omont's edition.

Through the kind courtesy of M. Omont I have since obtained photographs of most of the leaves which I had deciphered. By printing from the reverse side of the negative the task of decipherment is somewhat facilitated; and in some cases letters can be read from the photographs which I did not succeed in reading in the faint yellow stain of the MS.

In order that in so delicate an undertaking I might not rely on my own unaided eyesight and judgment, I have gladly availed myself of the help of the Rev. H. S. Cronin, Dean of Trinity Hall, who has checked my transcription partly by the photographs but mainly by a fresh collation of the pages in the MS itself.

In my transcription minuscules supplied within brackets indicate letters which are not traceable in the codex. Other minuscules represent letters which appear to be present but cannot be read with complete certainty. All that is printed in uncials, together with all accents, breathings and stops (excepting those which belong to words within brackets) may, I believe, be regarded as certain evidence of the text of Codex H as it left the hands of the scribe who re-inked the letters. We cannot of course by this process hope to get back behind his handiwork.

The recent criticism to which Codex H has been subjected has made it desirable to note a few minor points connected with it, which it did not fall within the scope of M. Omont's edition to indicate. Moreover in some instances I have been able to distinguish between the original reading and a subsequent correction. I have accordingly added some notes based on a comparison of M. Omont's edition with the leaves preserved at Paris and with the photographs of some of the other leaves¹.

¹ See above, p. 2, n. 2.

1 Co x 19—21

opposite Coislin 202 fol. 1 r

[*o*] ΤΙ [*ei*] Δωλοθύτοντι ε [στιν]

ΗΟΤΙΕΙΔωλοντιεστι

δλαοτιάθυογειν [*δ*] ε

μονιοικάιογθω

θγογειν

ογθελωδεγμασκοι

νωνογκτωνδαι

μονωνγινεθαι

ογδγνασθαιποτηρ [*ιον*]

ιο κγπινειν

[*kai*] ποτηριονδαιμονιω

ογδγνασθαιπραπεζης

κγμετεχειν

[*kai* τραπέζης] ΔΔΙΜ [*ονιων.*]

15

10, 11 Mr Cronin notes: "I can see no traces of *kai* at the end of l. 10; but I can see traces of it at the beginning of l. 11, including the accent."

1 Co x 30—32

opposite Coislin 202 fol. 1 v

ΜΟΥΚΡΙΝΕΤΑΙ

ὝΠΑΛΛΗCCΥΝΕΙΔΗCΕΩC

εἰεΓωχάριτιμετε[χω]

[τι]ΒλαсφημοУмдai[иπέρ]

5 ογεГωεγχαρистω.

εῖτεογνεсθίετ[ε]

εῖτεπίνετε

εῖτετιποιεῖται

πάνταείсдóзан[θv]

10 ποιεῖται

δπρόскоποικάи[ιον]

ΔΔίоисгіненсθа[и]

κδιελλ[ησιν και]

τή̄[κκλησία τοῦ θv]

15

1 Co xi 6—8

opposite Coislin 202 fol. 2 r

[ει] ΔΕΔΙCΧΡΟΝΓΥΝΔΙ[κι]

ΤΩΚΕΙΡΔΑСΘΔΙΗ[ξυ]

ΡΔАСΘΔИ

5 [κα] ΤΔΚΔΛΥΠΤΈСθω

ΔΝΗΡΜĒΝΓΔΡΟ΢Κ[δ]

ΦΙΛΕΙΚΑΤΔΚΔΛУ

ΠΤΕСθΔΙΤΗНКЕФΔ[λην]

εικѡнкдіаðзаðу

10 ҮПАРХѠН.

[η γυ] ННΔĒΔОЗАðНДР[ός]

ЕСТИ[ν].

[οὐ γάρ ἐστι] НΔН [ηρ]

1 Co xi 17—20
opposite Coislin 202 fol. 2 v

τογ[τ]οδεπλ[ραγγ]έλ[λων]

[οὐ]κεπλαινω

ότιούκειστοκρίττ[ον]

αλλειστόντονγνε[ρ]

χειθαι·

πρωτονμένγαρπγ[νερ]

χομένωνύμων

ένέκκλησία

ἀκογωσχίσματαέν

ύμεινύπάρχειν

καιμέροστιπιστε[νω]

δεῖγάρκαιαιρέσεις

ένγμεινειν[αι]

ινακαιοίδοκι[μοι φανεροι]

γενωνται[έν ν μήν]

συνερχ[ομένων οὖν ν μῶν]

15

14 Mr Cronin reads ιναοιδοκ[ιμοι], beginning at the inner line.
I thought that I could see ινακαι, beginning at the outer line.

Gr. iv 27—80
opposite Paris Buppl. 1074 fol. 1 v

πολύτιμος οὐγέας·
οὐ πολλά τά τέκνα
οισέριμο γάλα[ον]
πολλοὶ χορευτοί.
β ΑΝΔΡΑΣ·
γέλεισλέλελφοι
βατλέδαλεναρρε
λαστέκναέστε·
λλαστέρετότεο
κατάσκραψεντι
οισέλιμορετο[ρ]
κατάηνα.
οὐτοράίνυν·
λλαλτίλερετίγραφο
έκβαλετίνησλεκτι[ρ]

Gul v. 6—10

opposite Paris Suppl. 1074 fol. 1 v

ἐΝΓΑΡΧΟΙ
 οὐτε περιτομή τοιούτη
 οὐτε ἀκροβυστία
 ἀλλὰ πίστις λαγαπή
 ἐΝΕΡΓΟΥ Μένης
 ἔτρεχε τε καὶ [λῶν]
 τις γάστερνέ κουψέντη
 λαθοείδη πίστισσαι
 ἡ πιστονή οὐκέκτοι
 καλούντος γάστερ
 μικράζυμη δλοντόφυ
 ραμαζύμοι
 ἐγρόπεποι θαλεῖστούμασ
 ἐΝΚΟΥ
 οτιούδενάλλο φροῦρο [μετε]

Col i 23—26

opposite Paris Suppl. 1074 fol. 2 r

ΝΥΝΧΑΙΡΩ ΕΝΤΟΙСПΑ
 θημασιμύπερυμων
 καιδναπληρώταλύτε
 ρήματατωνθλί⁵
 ψεωντογχύεντη
 σάρκείμογ
 γπερτογσωματο[ε]δαγ
 τογ.οέστινηέκκλησ[α]
 ησεγενόμηνέγωδιακορος
 κατατήνοικονομίαν
 τογθυτηνδοθείσα[ν]
 μοιειςγμας
 πληρωσαιτονλογοντ[οῦ]
 θυτομυστήριοντο

10

15

Col ii 8—11
opposite Paris Suppl. 1074 fol. 3 r

καὶ κενής [ἀπάτης]
 κατατηνπαραδοσιν
 των [ἀνων]
 κατάταστοιχιατούκοσμου
 καιούκαταχν·
 οτιέναγ्यτώκατοικι· πᾶν
 τόπληρωματῆσθεο
 τητοσσωματικῶς·
 καὶεστὲέναγ्यτώπεπλη
 ρωμένοι·
 οσέστινέκεφαλήπάσης
 ἀρχησκαιεζογίας·
 ἐνώκαιπεριετμηθητε
 περιτομῆλχειροποιη[τῷ]
 εντηπεκάγγει· τοῦσώ
 ματοστησσαρκός·

5

10

15

Col ii 17—19

opposite Paris Suppl. 1074 fol. 4 r

τοδεσωμαχ̄·
 μηδειςύμασκαταβρ̄·
 βεγετω.θέλωνεντα
 πινοφροσύνηκαι
 θρησκίατωνἀγγελω·
 αμηέορακενεμβατεγω·
 είκηφυσιογμενοσυπο
 τογνοοστησαρκος
 αγτογ·καιογκρατων
 τηνκεφαλην·
 ἐζογπαν·τοσωμαδιατω
 ἀφωνκαιιγνδεсмω·
 επιχορηгоменон
 καιсумбивазомено
 аyzеithnayzhcintov θū

Heb ii 9—10

opposite Coislin 202 fol. 6 r

πάθηματοῦ θανάτου
 δόξηκαιτίμηεστεφα
 νωμένονόπως χα
 ριτιθύψερπαντος.
 5 γεγχτεθανάτου
 ἐπρεπενγάραγτῶδιο
 τάπάντακαίδιογ
 τάπαντα
 πολλὸγάγιογείσδο
 ΙΟ ζανάγαγοντα
 τονἀρχηγοντης

Heb ii 17—18

opposite Coislin 202 fol. 6 v

ΙΝΔΕΛΕΗΜΩΝ ΓΕΝΗΤΑΙ
 καὶ πιστός αρχιερεὺς
 τὰ πρόστον θν.,
 εἰς τὸ ιλασκεθαῖτας
 ἀμαρτίαστογλαού
 ενώγαρπεπονθεν
 [αὐτὸς] πειράσθεις δὲ
 [να] ταῖτοις πειράζο

10

15

Heb xii 16—18

opposite Paris Suppl. 1074 fol. 5 v

ΜΗΤΙCΠΟΡΝΟCΗ[βέβη]¹

[λο] c ω c t c α γ·

[δε] α ΝΤΙΒρω c e ω c [μιᾶς]

ΔΠΕΔΟΤΟΤΔΠ[ρωτο]

ΤΟΚΙΔ αυτοΥ

ΙCTΕΓΔΡΟΤΙΚΔΙM[ετέ]

Π ειταθ ε λ ω Ν[κληρο]

ΝΟΜΗCΑΙΤΗΝε[υλογή]

ΔΝΔΠΕΔΟΚΙM[άσθη]

ΙΟ ΜΕΤΔΝΟΙΔΑCΓΔΡΤ[όπον]

ΟΥΚΕΥΡΕΝΚΔ[ιπερ]

ΜΕΤΔΔΑΚΡΥΩ[ν εκ]

ΖΗΤΗCΑCΔΑΥ[τήν]

ΟΥΓΔΡΠΠΡΟCΕΛΗ[λύθατε]

ΠΥΡΙΨΗΛΑΦΩ[μένῳ]

15

¹ About one third of the page is cut away.

Heb xiii 21—24

opposite Paris Suppl. 1074 fol. 6 r

[ἐνώπιον αὐτού διὰ τὸ Χρῖ]

[φίλη]δοξα εἰς τοὺς [αιῶνας]

νας ἀμήν

[παρακαλῶ] Δὲ γέγονος

5

ἀλεφοὶ

[ἀνέχεσθαι τοῦ λόγου]

τησπαρακλησεως·

καὶ γάρ διαβραχέων· εἰπέντε

τιλαγμεῖν·

10

γινώσκετε τὸν ἀλεφ

φόνημῶν τιμοθέου [οντος]

ἀπολελυμένον·

μεθογέαντα χιονέρχηται

οψομαιγμας

15

ἀσπασασθαι πάντας τοὺς

ἥρογμενους

1 Tim i 4—7

opposite Paris Suppl. 1074 fol. 7 r

[μηδέ] προσέχειν [μύ]

θοισκαιίγενεαλογί

αἰσάπεράντοις

διτινεczητήσεισπί[α]

ρέχογιμάλλονφοικό

νομιανθυτήνενπλετ[ει]

τὸδέτέλοστάσπαρα[γ]

γελείασέετίν

ἀγαπηέκκλαθαράσκαρδ[ίας]

καὶγνειαίσεωστκαι¹

πίστεωσάνυποκριτού

ώντινεσάστοχεσαν

τεσέζετράπησαν

εἰσματεολογίαν

θέλοντεσέειναινομο

διδασκαλοι·

¹ There is no trace of any note to correspond to the cross in this line. The word *ἀγαθῆς* has been dropped.

1 Tim ii 14—iii 2
opposite Paris Suppl. 1074 fol. 10 v

Η ΔΕ ΓΥΝΗ Ε ΖΗ

5

ΜΕΤΑΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝ [ης]

ΠΙΣΤΟΣΟ [λόγος]

10 επιτισεπισκοπή [δρέγεται]

καλογέργογεπιθ [υμεῖ.]

ΔΕΙΟΥΝΤΟΝΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟ [ν]

ΔΝΕΠΙΛΗΜΠΤΟΝ

15

2 Tim i 17—ii 1

opposite Turin B. I. v. fol. 2 r

5

ΔΛΛΑΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟC

EZHTHCEMEE [καὶ]

ΕΥΡΕ

10

ΔΩΗΔΥ[τ]ΩΟ[κ]CΕΥΡΕΙΝ

ΕΛΕΟCΠΑΡΑΚΥΕΝΕ

ΚΕ[ινη τη μέρα]

ΚΔΙΟCΔΕΝΕΦ[έσω]

[διηκόνησεν]

15

ΒΕΛΤΙΟΝCΥΓΙ[γώσκεις]

CYOvv

[This leaf was read from the photograph at Paris.]

Notes on M. Omont's transcript of Cod. H.

p. 13, Coisl. 1 *r*, 14 marg. For ψαλμ̄ read ψαλμ̄, that is ψαλμου.

16. Here ε̄i projects to the left of the outer line of writing. A close examination shews that ε̄ιδε̄ is in part over an erasure: and the base of the δ is continued with an upward slant so as to form the central bar of the following ε̄. This points to the hand of the re-inker; see p. 37, Coisl. 8 *v*, 8 marg., where the same peculiarity is found in the δε̄ of ἀδελφο̄i. We may safely assume that the reading of H* was ε̄ι τις καλε̄i.

Coisl. 1 *v*, 1. In the space left before ἀπίctων can faintly be read the letters των, which have been erased.

The note at the foot of this page is in the hand of the re-inker.

p. 15, Kieff 1 *r*, 6. The first γ, which stands to the left of the inner line, is of a ruder character than the second, and was no doubt originally placed there by the less firm hand of the re-inker.

p. 24, Coisl. (Petersb.) 4 *v*, 9. αγτῶ should begin with the inner line.

p. 28, Par. S. 3 *r*, 2. There is now a hole in the MS, so that the three letters τοc have entirely perished.

Par. S. 3 *v*, 12. τε at the beginning of this line is out of place, as the second part of a divided word would commence at the inner line. As a matter of fact under θη of the previous line parts of θητε can be traced, the ε being somewhat smaller than usual.

12, 13. ἀγ|τᾶ··ε̄n is rendered suspicious by the position of τᾶ, which commences at the outer line. The words are the addition of the re-inker. ἐγχαριτία commences with the inner line, and not as in Omont's edition under the p of the line above.

p. 29, Par. S. 4 *v*, 13 marg. ἀδελφο̄i. is by the re-inker's hand. It seems to be an addition of a lectionary character (cf. p. 37, Coisl. 8 *v*).

p. 33, Coisl. 5 *r*. The letters δ̄, β̄, γ̄ are in red: as also is the β̄ on the *verso*.

p. 34, Mosc. M. R. *r*, 2. There is space for one letter between τογ̄ and δι. The words δι' ἑαγτογ̄ are not original.

5. τογ̄ θρόν8 is in the re-inker's hand, and betrays his tendency towards minuscule writing.

13. Read ψαλῳ.

Mosc. M. R. v, 1 marg. There is no trace of ἐτῶ in the margin of the photograph, but only above ἔσομαι.

11, 15. Read ψαλῳ.

p. 35, Coisl. 6 r, 4 marg. Read ψαλῳ. The whole of these references are here in red.

p. 37, Coisl. 8 v, 8 marg. Cf. supra, on p. 13, Coisl. 1 r, 16 and p. 29, Par. S. 4 v, 13 marg.

13. There is nothing in the codex which explains the misplacement of αc.

p. 38, Mosc. Syn. 1 r, 7. There is something like a stroke over the last α of this line: so that possibly the plural (*δύνανται*) was once read; but it is difficult to speak with certainty, as this portion of the photograph is very black.

10. In the right-hand margin, where the photograph is very black, appears to be: Θκαν.

I should expect that the left-hand bottom corner of this page would contain the quire-number $\overline{M\Delta}$: but the photograph shews no distinct trace of it.

Mosc. Syn. 1 v, 5 marg. In the left margin I read ψαλῳ
 $\overline{\lambda\theta}$

p. 39, Mosc. Syn. 2 r, 2. ὄνειδ: possibly ὄνιδ.

At the bottom, the note is in the re-inker's hand.

p. 41, Par. S. 6 r. The subscription in red, and the border in red and black.

Par. S. 6 v. The heading in red, and the letters marking the chapter-numbers.

p. 42, Coisl. 10 r. The chapter-numbers here, and on the *verso*, in red.

In the left-hand bottom corner was the quire-number $\overline{M\zeta}$, of which the μ can still be traced.

p. 43, Par. S. 7 v, 13. The n above the line is from the re-inker.

p. 44, Par. S. 8 r, 14. There are distinct traces of ω under the ον of πρώτον: so that the original reading was πρωτω.

Par. S. 8 v, 7 marg. σοφῷ is written over the same word, the blacker ink of which still shews through.

15. For 'n read ἐν.

p. 45, Par. S. 9 *r*, 14. The first Δ of $\delta\pi\alpha\bar{\eta}$ is not certain. There is a hole in the MS, and the remains of Δ are perhaps traceable.

p. 47, Coisl. 9 *v*. In the right-hand corner there are traces of red flourishes such as elsewhere surround the quire-numbers. Probably \overline{mz} was formerly here, marking the end of the quire. The whole of the quire $\overline{m\bar{h}}$ is lost.

p. 48, Tur. 1 *v*, 5. The $\pi\Delta$ of $\pi\rho\gamma\pi\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\bar{\eta}$ has been altered to $\tau\bar{i}\tau\Delta$, so as to give the reading $\pi\rho\alpha\bar{v}\tau\bar{i}\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\bar{\eta}$.

p. 49, Tur. 2 *r*, 9. $c\bar{v}$ is added by the re-inker in rougher characters outside the outer line of the writing, and the original $c\bar{v}n$ changed into $o\bar{v}n$.

12. \bar{r} stands further to the left in the MS, and the o begins at the outer line.

Tur. 2 *v*, 7. $\Delta\omega\zeta\epsilon\iota$ seems to have been the original reading. A very large ω now covers part of the old ω and c .

8. There are distinct traces of n at the end of the line. $\pi\alpha\zeta\in\bar{n}$ must be taken as the original reading.

9. The Euthalian chapter-number $\bar{\lambda}$ is traceable in the left margin.

p. 50, Coisl. 11 *r*. The chapter-numbers were originally small and red: they are now brown and large. $\sigma\tau\bar{i}\chi\bar{o}\cdot\bar{h}$ with its ornaments is in red. So too the title on the *verso*.

p. 51, Coisl. 12 *r*, 11. \bar{r} more to the left, so that $\pi\pi\epsilon\bar{v}\bar{y}\tau\bar{a}\bar{\eta}$ begins with the outer line. So do $\sigma\bar{e}\bar{m}\bar{n}\bar{o}\bar{y}\bar{c}$ and $\bar{c}\bar{o}\bar{f}\bar{r}\bar{o}\bar{n}\bar{a}\bar{c}$ below.

p. 52, Coisl. 13 *r*. The flourish in the left corner is exaggerated by Omont. It is not the sign of a vanished quire-number.

Coisl. 13 *v*. This page is in red. A very fair idea of the original red letters, which here remain untouched, is given by the somewhat idealised reproduction of Silvestre.

p. 53, Coisl. 14 *r*, 9. The last letter was n , over which r is written in a darker hand. See Omont's facsimile. He himself makes the correction on p. 56.

Coisl. 14 *v*, ll. 2 and 8 are in red, with the exception of the breathings, accents and points.

The following is a summary of the results of the above investigation, so far as they are of importance for the text of H.

1 Co x 27 $\epsilon\iota\tau\bar{i}\bar{s}$ H*, $\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\tau\bar{i}\bar{s}$ H**

Col ii 7	om. <i>εν αυτῃ</i> H*, ins. H**
He i 3	om. <i>δι εαυτου</i> H*, ins. H**
He x 1	forsitan <i>δυνανται</i> H
2	<i>ου επαυσαντο</i> H*, <i>ουκ αν επαυσαντο</i> H** (<i>vid.</i>)
1 Tim i 16	<i>πρωτω</i> H*, <i>πρωτον</i> H**
vi 11	<i>πραυπαθειαν</i> H*, <i>πραυτητα θειαν</i> H** corr
2 Tim ii 3	<i>συνκακοπαθησον</i> H*, <i>συ ουν κακοπαθησον</i> H**
7	<i>δωσει</i> H*, <i>δωει</i> H**

The relation of Codex H to the Euthalian edition.

The evidence which attests the connection between Codex H and the Euthalian edition of the Pauline Epistles falls under three heads: the colometrical arrangement, the remains of the Euthalian apparatus, and the colophon. The last of these deserves a special consideration.

We have seen reason for believing that the work of Euthalius underwent a series of modifications, the first intention of which apparently was to reduce the bulk of his prolegomena and notes without seriously impairing their usefulness. We have seen too that one epitomiser of his work so far succeeded in retaining the words of his original, as to produce the impression that his short summary was actually written by Euthalius himself¹. We must now carefully examine the language of this colophon to see whether we may not have in it an exactly similar phenomenon.

Let us first note its closing words: *ἀντεβληθη δε η βιβλος προς το εν Καισαριᾳ ἀντιγραφον της βιβλιοθήκης τον ἀγίου Παμφίλου, χειρι γεγραμμένον <αύτοῦ>*². These words would receive a perfectly natural interpretation, if we supposed that the scribe of H, or more probably of the archetype of H, had checked the copy, which he had written from a Euthalian codex, by the famous MS written by Pamphilus himself. The reason why he did not copy at once from the Codex of Pamphilus would doubtless be that he desired to reproduce the Euthalian colometry. In this part of the colophon then we shall not expect to find traces of

¹ See above, pp. 29 ff.

² Montfaucon read the last letter of *αύτοῦ*, but it is no longer legible in the ms, which is much injured at this point.

Euthalian phraseology. The similar colophon at the end of the Catholic Epistles, given by Zacagni (p. 513), points to a like process, as we have already seen.

The earlier part of the colophon we may now compare with certain passages of the genuine Euthalian writings.

ἔγραψα καὶ ἔξεθέμην κατὰ δίναμιν
στειχηρὸν τόδε τὸ τεῦχος Παύλου τοῦ
ἀποστόλου,

πρὸς ἔγγραμμον καὶ εὐκαταλήμπτον
ἀνάγνωσιν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀδελφῶν,
παρ' ὅν ἀπάντων τόλμης συνγνώμην
αἰτῶ,

εὐχῇ τῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν συμπεριφορὰν
κομιζόμενος.

Z. 410 ἐκθέμενος ὀλιγοστὴν ἀνακε-
φαλαίωσιν

Z. 428 ἐκτιθέμεθα γοῦν αὐτὴν (sc.
κεφαλαίων ἐκθεσιν) καθ' ἵστορίαν Λουκᾶ
κ.τ.λ.

Z. 410 πρὸς εὔσημον ἀνάγνωσιν

Z. 405 συγγνώμην τε πλείστην αἰτῶν
ἐπ' ἀμφοῖν, τόλμης ὄμοιν καὶ προπετείας
τῆς ἐμῆς

Z. 476 ἐφ' οἷς οὖν ἔγωγε τολμῶ, συγ-
γνώμην αἰτῶ κ.τ.λ.

Z. 428 αἰτοῦντες συγγνώμην προπε-
τείας...παρ' ὑμῶν ἐκάστου τῶν ἀναγι-
νωσκόντων, εὐχῇ τῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν
συμπεριφορὰν κομιζόμενοι

Z. 477 εὐχῇ τῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν

Z. 405 διορθοῦσθαι δέ μοι μᾶλλον
ἀδελφικῶς κατὰ συμπεριφοράν κ.τ.λ.

Here we may note several details which awaken suspicion.

(1) The colophon is written in the first person *singular*, as are several short notices which we have already been obliged to reject (see pp. 17, 34).

(2) Euthalius does not use the word *ἔξεθέμην* in speaking of his edition as a whole. *'Εκτίθεσθαι* and *ἐκθεσις* he employs in a different sense, in reference to his lists of chapter-summaries.

(3) *στειχηρὸν* (l. *στιχηρὸν*) seems to be a confusion between *στιχηρῶς* and *στιχηδόν*, the latter being the word used by Euthalius.

(4) In *τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀδελφῶν* the writer passes from the first person singular to the first person plural. This offers no special difficulty; for *ἡμᾶς* need not be confined to the speaker himself. But lower down he embodies a Euthalian phrase: *εὐχῇ τῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν συμπεριφορὰν κομιζόμενοι*. Here he is obliged

to change *κομιζόμενοι* into *κομιζόμενος*: and either he himself, or more probably the scribe of H, felt it necessary to make the further alteration of *ἡμῶν* into *ἐμῶν*, to avoid a grammatical inconsistency.

We may conclude then that this colophon is from the pen of some one who had in some way adapted the work of Euthalius, and wished to claim credit in Euthalian terms for the task which he had accomplished. When we find the name of Evagrius as the nominative to *ἔγραψα* in the Cod. Neap. at this place, and also apparently in the almost obliterated first line of this page of Codex H; and when we meet with it again in Cod. Neap. in connection with a somewhat similar claim (see above, p. 6); we are tempted to attribute definitely to this Evagrius an *editio minor* of the work of Euthalius on these epistles¹. If, further, he is the author of the *Martyrium Pauli*, which similarly embodies Euthalian phrases, we can fix his date as A.D. 396, and may perhaps go on to identify him with Evagrius Ponticus, to whom our attention has been directed by Dr Ehrhard.

¹ I am glad to find that this view, which had occurred to me independently, is also that of Herr von Dobschütz, though we differ entirely on the subject of the dates. (*Cent. f. Bibl.* x. 50 ff.)

CHAPTER V.

THE ARMENIAN VERSION AND ITS SUPPOSED RELATION TO EUTHALIUS.

I HAVE referred above (p. 10) to a theory which Mr Conybeare has endeavoured to base upon the coincidence that certain Armenian MSS contain the same colophon as Codex H of the Pauline Epistles. The theory would, if it were proved, have a considerable importance for the textual criticism of a large part of the New Testament. Although I cannot myself accept it—at any rate, not in the form in which it has been stated—I am grateful to Mr Conybeare for having put it forward. The examination of it has confirmed me in an opinion, which has been for some time growing in my mind, and which appears to me to raise the Armenian Version to a position of importance even higher than that which Mr Conybeare has claimed for it. I shall therefore take this opportunity of calling attention to certain phenomena presented by this Version, which I should not otherwise have ventured to discuss until I had been able to make my investigation more systematic and complete.

The origin of the Armenian Version of the New Testament.

The statements of early Armenian writers respecting the origin of the Armenian Version of the Bible, though claiming to come to us from the younger contemporaries of the great translators S. Isaac and S. Mesrob, combine a certain conflict of assertion with a suspicious family likeness. They have been collected and discussed—but without the requisite historical scepticism—by Father Carekin of the Mechitarist monastery of S. Lazzaro in his valuable work entitled *A Catalogue of ancient Armenian translations* (Venice, 1889, pp. 87 ff.). They are ac-

cessible to Western scholars generally in the collection of French translations of Armenian historians published at Paris in 1886—9 by M. Victor Langlois¹. They are conveniently summarised in the short section on the Armenian Version which Mr F. C. Conybeare has contributed to the fourth edition (1894) of Scrivener's *Introduction to N. T. Criticism*². I need not therefore cite them here.

One fact which seems to stand out distinctly after the perusal of these puzzling statements is that the earliest attempts at translating the Scriptures into Armenian were based on Syriac codices. This is confirmed by the tradition that up to the time in question the Syriac language had been commonly used in the services of the Armenian Church, which were in consequence, it is said, unintelligible to the mass of the people. It receives a further confirmation when we remember that much of the early Armenian literature consists of translations from famous Syriac writers, such as Ephraim and Aphrahat, and that even Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History was translated into Armenian from a Syriac manuscript.

Our authorities further tell us that S. Mesrob's disciples presently brought to their master certain trustworthy Greek codices from Constantinople, and that by the aid of these either the former translation was carefully revised, or a completely new version was made. Between the two alternatives we cannot decide on the ground of history alone. If any further light is to be thrown on the subject, it must come from a study of the Version itself as it is preserved to us to-day.

Mr Conybeare, who has laid students of early Christian literature under a great obligation by his researches in Etchmiadzin and elsewhere, has endeavoured in his interesting article on 'the

¹ They will be found in the second volume as follows: Goriun, *Life of S. Mesrob*, pp. 10 ff.; Moses of Choren (iii. 53) p. 162, (iii. 60 f.) pp. 167 f.; Lazar Pharbetzi, p. 267.

² This section is by far the most useful account hitherto given of the Version. It is perhaps due to M. Emine (the translator of Goriun in Langlois' series), who is charged with 'adding to and omitting from the Armenian text at random' (*loc. cit.* p. 148 n. 1) and condemned as 'untrustworthy in all ways,' to point out that in a prefatory note (p. 4) it is stated that his translation was made not from the Venice Edition of 1833, but from what was regarded as a better recension printed, likewise in Venice, in 1854.

Codex Pamphili and the date of Euthalius' (see above, pp. 8 ff.) to find a solution of the problem so far as the Pauline Epistles are concerned. He gives us, as we have seen, some noteworthy information, derived in part from an Armenian Codex in the British Museum (Add. 19,730), with regard to the form in which certain portions of the Euthalian apparatus are found in Armenian manuscripts of the New Testament.

We may I think consider it established that there is a close link of connection between Codex H and a certain group of Armenian codices, of which B. M. Add. 19,730 is perhaps at present the best representative. Can we draw from this any conclusion as to the origin of the Armenian Version itself? Mr Conybeare thinks that we can. His explanation of the phenomena is as follows: "The Armenian fathers translated the Epistles of Paul early in the fifth century along with the rest of the Bible. They selected for translation what we may call the new edition by Euthalius, which comprised the text of Pamphilus."

His argument is this: The colophon of H is found in certain Armenian MSS. Therefore it is probable that there is a relation between the text of H and the text from which the Armenian Version was translated. But the text of H is the text of Euthalius in what has hitherto been considered its purest form. And that text as the colophon in question shews is copied from the codex written by Pamphilus himself. Probably, therefore, the Armenian Version, which is older than Codex H, is our best witness to the text of Pamphilus. The detailed proof of the actual coincidence of the text implied by the Armenian Version and the text already known to be Euthalian is all that is required to translate this conclusion from the region of probability to the region of certainty.

It has been pointed out above (p. 9) that the Euthalian matter occurs in different shapes in different Armenian MSS; so that it is extremely precarious to assume that in any one of these shapes it comes from the original translators of the Version. It must further be noted that the colophon of H only declares that the codex to which it originally applies was corrected by (*ἀντεβλήθη πρὸς...*), not "copied from," the Codex of Pamphilus. We do not even know that the colophon is all composed by the same hand.

Whoever may be the author of the first part of it, the second part may well be the addition of a scribe who corrected a Euthalian copy at a later time in the library of Caesarea.

In any case it is clear that the whole burden of the proof of Mr Conybeare's position must lie upon the actual relation of the *text* of Codex H to the *text* of the Armenian Version. The subsidiary apparatus may be a useful finger-post; but that is all. And finger-posts have sometimes been turned round so as to point the traveller along the wrong road.

Mr Conybeare has therefore rightly devoted a considerable part of his article to the comparison of the two texts; and he has entered upon the perilous paths of New Testament textual criticism under the guidance of a recent German writer, whose judgment and accuracy are less praiseworthy than his industry¹. I do not propose at this point to follow him in his investigation; as I think that I can do better service in the first instance by attempting to approach the problem from a wholly different side.

Our examination of the historical accounts of the origin of the Armenian Version suggested the possibility that, when "the trustworthy Greek codices" were brought from Constantinople, the earlier translation from Syriac codices was not altogether cast aside, but was made the basis of a careful revision. The hint thus offered to us is surely worthy of an attentive consideration.

Our knowledge of the Old Syriac Version of the Gospels, prior to the revision known as the Peshito, has of late been largely increased by the publication of the Sinai Palimpsest. If it should prove that in the Gospels the Armenian text contains a considerable Old Syriac element, which escaped the revising hand which corrected the first Armenian translation by the help of Greek codices, then we have at least a presumption in favour of explaining many of the peculiarities of the Armenian Version of the Pauline Epistles as well by referring them to an Old Syriac base.

¹ Bousset's *Textkritische Studien* (in Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 1894). I do not wish to disparage unnecessarily a most laborious piece of work in a field which has of late been strangely neglected in Germany: but what are we to say of a critic of Dr Hort, who interprets his symbol *cu*² (=2 cursives) as the *second hand* of the Curetonian Syriac in *S. Mark*? See Bousset, p. 98, l. 1. I should not call attention to this inaccuracy if it stood alone.

The Armenian Version of the Gospels.

We may begin by examining a few passages from the Gospels, in which the Armenian Version offers us a rendering which is not easily accounted for by supposing it to be a direct translation of any known reading of the Greek text.

1. Mt v. 18. "Ἐως ἀν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἵωτα ἐν ἡ μία κεραίᾳ οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου...."

Arm. "Until heaven and earth pass away, one *yot*, which is one letter (*յովս մի՛ որ նշանախեց մի է*), shall not pass from the law...."

Here we note (1) that the Semitic letter *yot* or *jod* has taken the place of the Greek *iota*; (2) that *κεραίᾳ* is regarded as a whole letter, and not as the little projection which differentiates one letter from another; (3) that *κεραίᾳ* is made to become a sort of explanation of the *yot*, the disjunctive particle being replaced by a relative pronoun.

When we turn to the Sinaitic Palimpsest (Syr^{sin}), we find :

Ե Յ Ո Ւ Ա Խ Ա Խ Ո Ւ Ա

that is to say, "One *yodh* letter shall not pass away." Now Ա Խ Ա Խ, a side form of Ա Խ 'a sign,' is used to translate *κεραίᾳ* in Lc xvi. 17: so that we may be sure that it is meant to represent the *κεραίᾳ* of the Greek text in the present passage. Thus we see that Cureton's text (Syr^{ea}) has suffered correction from a later hand, when it reads :

Ա Խ Ա Խ Ո Ր Ա Խ Ա Խ Ո Ր

i.e. "One *yodh* letter or one horn."

The word in the Armenian which I have rendered 'letter' (Ա Խ Ա Խ) is derived from the ordinary word for 'sign' (Ա Խ Ա Ն), and stands accordingly in the same sort of relationship to it as does Ա Խ Ա Խ to Ա Խ. It is used again in Lc xvi. 17.

We see then that Syr^{sin}, which is clearly the original form of the Old Syriac at this point, sufficiently explains the three points of peculiarity which we have noted in the Armenian Version.

Before we leave this verse we may get still further confirmation of the position that the Armenian has an important element in common with the Old Syriac. For to the words "shall not pass away from the law," it adds "and from the prophets." The only Greek evidence for the addition *καὶ τῶν προφητῶν* appears to be the so-called Ferrar-group¹, which again and again accompanies the Old Syriac and the Armenian in very remarkable readings. It is not found in the Sinaitic, Curetonian or Peshito Syriac. But it occurs in the Jerusalem Syriac, which not unfrequently seems to preserve very ancient Syriac readings: and Zahn (*Forschungen*, I. 134) has cited two passages from Aphrahat², which have this addition, while at the same time they read in the earlier part of the verse simply "One letter *yodh*." The whole of the evidence falls into line if we suppose that the Old Syriac reading was that which the Armenian and Aphrahat attest: that Syr^{sin} shews us the first stage of correction to the Greek by which "and the prophets" was struck out; and that Syr^{eu} shews a yet further stage of correction when the words "or one horn" were inserted. If this be a true account of the matter, it is plain that the Armenian Version assumes a new importance as a witness in certain cases to the earliest form of the Syriac Version of the Gospels.

2. Mt x. 10, Mc vi. 8, Lc ix. 3. In the accounts given by S. Matthew and S. Luke of the Mission of the Twelve we read, among other prohibitions, that they were forbidden to take a staff (*μηδὲ ῥάβδον* Mt, *μήτε ῥάβδον* Lc). But in S. Mark's narrative they are allowed to take "a staff only" (*εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον*).

¹ The addition is found in 18-124-556: it is also found in the Latin version of Irenaeus (Mass. p. 275).

² Wright's edition, p. 30, l. 3.

and l. 20,

is the solution of the difficulty which is found in Tatian's Diatessaron (Eph. Comm., Moes. p. 91): but whether Tatian invented the distinction, or only adopted it from an existing Syriac Version, is part of a large problem upon which we cannot enter here.

Now can it be a mere coincidence that in the Armenian Version we find a similar distinction of words; 'no stick' (*Թ ցուպ*) in S. Matthew, and 'but only a staff' (*բայց միայն գաւազան*) in S. Mark? It is true that in S. Luke the Armenian has 'no staff,' so that there the distinction is obliterated: but this is no more than has happened in Syr^{cu}, which is wanting for Mt and Lc, and reads "staff" in Lc¹.

3. In Mt xxviii. 18, after the words "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth," the Peshito adds, "and as my Father sent me, I also send you." There seems to be no Greek evidence for this addition, which is clearly derived from Jo xx. 21. Many Old Syriac readings survive in the Peshito, having escaped the vigilance of the reviser. This may well be an example of such survival. Indeed it is quite possible that it may be a relic of Tatian's Harmony, especially as the form in which Mt xxviii. 19 is quoted in Aphrahat makes it probable that the addition was present in his text². Unfortunately Syr^{sin} and Syr^{cu} are both mutilated at the end of S. Matthew, so that we have no direct evidence of the reading of the Old Syriac. But the same words, with the sole exception of the introductory particle "and," are found in the Armenian Version. This was observed long ago by Mill, though he suggested no theory to account for it.

We may now present in the briefest possible form a few more instances in which it appears that the Armenian Version, in spite

¹ Syr^{hier} only gives us S. Luke's account, and there it reads *թառ* ('stick').

² Aphrahat (Wr. p. 12, l. 7) says: "And again to the apostles *when he sent them*, thus said he to them: Go out and make disciples of all nations...." The fact that the words occur in the same position in the Arabic Harmony gives us no fresh evidence, as the text there contained is throughout influenced by the Peshito. No evidence on the point is offered by the Armenian of S. Ephraim's Commentary on the Diatessaron.

of the careful correction to which it has obviously been submitted, still retains traces of its Syriac ancestry.

4. Mt vii. 6 μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἄγιον τοῖς κυσίν.

Arm. զսրբութիւն, 'holiness' = Syr^{cu pesh} ՀԱՅՈՒԹ : Syr^{sin} vacat.

5. Mt viii. 3 ἐκαθερίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα.

Arm. ՚ի նմանէ, 'from him' = Syr^{sin cu} Ուշած : Tisch. cites as supporting ἀπ' αὐτοῦ only 'S al pauc.'

6. Mt x. 11 κάκεῖ μείνατε ἔως ἀν ἐξέλθητε.

Arm. և անդ լինիջիք, 'and there be' = Syr^{sin pesh} ՀՃԱԾ ՈՉՅԱ : Syr^{cu} vacat.

7. Mc vii. 19 ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται—καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα.

Arm. "For it entereth not into his heart, but into his belly, and goeth forth outside, and cleanseth all meats." With և արտաքս ելանէ, 'and goeth forth outside,' cf. Syr^{sin} (Syr^{cu} vacat) և ՀՃԱԾՅԱ, 'and is cast outside.'

8. Mc viii. 4 Πόθεν τούτοις δυνήσεται τις ὁδε χορτάσαι κ.τ.λ.

Arm. "Whence canst thou satisfy these men," &c.

The only evidence that I am aware of for 'canst thou' (կարես) is Syr^{sin} (Syr^{cu} vacat), ԾՆՐ ԱՀԱՅ.

9. Mc viii. 27 Τίνα με λέγοντιν οἱ ἀνθρωποι εἶναι;

Arm. զ՞ո՞ւստիք՝ ասեն զինէն մարդիկն՝ թէ իցեմ.

"Whom say men concerning me, that I am?"

This is an exact rendering of Syr^{pesh} (Syr^{cu} vacat). Syr^{sin} only differs by having 'What' for 'Whom.'

10. Mc viii. 38 ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἀγίων.

Arm. ‘and of the holy angels’ is supported only by Syr^{sin} (Syr^{cu} *vacat*).

11. Lc i. 61 καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτὴν ὅτι Οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου ὃς καλεῖται τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ.

Arm. “And they say to her, Because there is no one in thy kindred to whom is called the name John.”

‘In thy kindred’ (*յազգի քում*) = **ՀՃԱՎԵՐ** Syr^{sin pesh} (Syr^{cu} *vacat*): *ἐν τῇ συγγενείᾳ σου* is attested by C²DΓ, the Ferrar group and the Latins. But the addition of ‘John’ is, so far as I am aware, found only in Syr^{sin} (Syr^{cu} *vacat*), which has

ՅԱՅ ԲՈ ՌՋԵ ՌՈՒՆԱՅ

12. Lc xi. 17 καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἴκου πίπτει.

Arm. “and a house divided against itself falleth.” So exactly Syr^{pesh}: **ԱՅ ԱՎԵՏԱ ԱՎԵՏԱ ԼՈ ԲԺԵԱ**. Syr^{sin} is wanting: but Syr^{cu} has “and every house, that against a house is divided, falleth.” There seems to be no further evidence for the insertion of ‘divided’ in S. Luke.

13. Jo iv. 31 Ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ ἡρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες ‘Ραββεί, φάγε.

Arm. **Եւ մինչեւ եկեալ էին նոքա, աղաշէին զնա աշա-** կերտքն **և ասէին.** **Ուարբի՝ հաց կեր:** “And while they were not yet come, the disciples were beseeching him and saying, Rabbi, eat bread.”

Syr^{sin cu} “And his disciples were asking (‘from him,’ Syr^{cu}) that he would eat bread with them” (**ՀԱՅ ԱՎԵՏԱ ԼՈՒՆԱՅ**).

The Armenian seems to have been corrected by the Greek, a paraphrase being introduced for the troublesome *ἐν τῷ μεταξύ*, which the Syriac had dropped: but a trace of the Syriac remains in the phrase, ‘eat bread.’

14. Jo v. 22 ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκεν τῷ νίῳ.

Arm. “to his Son,” with Syr^{sin cu} Tat^{eph}. The insertion of the possessive pronoun is a marked feature of the Syriac language: but there is no ground for saying this of the Armenian. A parallel

instance is Jo xv. 16, "whatsoever ye ask my Father in my name," Syr^{sin} pesh (Syr^{eu} *vacat*) Arm.

15. Jo vi. 7 Διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτοι οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἔκαστος βραχὺ λάβῃ.

Arm. "although (**թէպէտ և**) each should take a little." The Syriac **եւ** might be rendered either as 'when' or as 'although.'

16. Jo xvii. 24 πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

Arm. "before that the world came to be," with Syr^{sin} (Syr^{eu} *vacat*).

These examples may suffice, though they might easily be added to, especially if we were to include the very numerous cases in which the Armenian and the Old Syriac are together and are supported in Greek only by the Ferrar group. But the relation of the Ferrar group to the Syriac offers a difficult problem in itself, and critics are by no means agreed upon a solution of it. I would only now hazard the opinion that the connecting link between the Armenian and the Ferrar group will be found in the Old Syriac base which I believe underlies the Armenian Version.

The points of resemblance which we have traced are in many instances very minute: but it is just this minuteness which has enabled them to escape the careful revision by which, according to our hypothesis, the first efforts of the Armenian translators were brought into a closer correspondence with the Greek codices.

It may be of interest, before we leave the Gospels, to examine in the light of what has been said above the very remarkable reading of the Armenian Version in Mt i. 16, a passage to which much attention has been devoted since the publication of the Sinaitic Syriac Palimpsest.

The Greek text of this verse runs: Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγένετο τὸν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ᾧ ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός.

Arm. Յակով ծնու զյովսէփ զայրն մարեմայ՝ որում

Խոսեցեալ զմարիամ կըս. յորմէ ծնաւն ՅԱ, որ անուանեցաւ ՔԱ.

The Armenian may be rendered literally thus: “Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, *to whom having been betrothed Mary the Virgin*, from whom was born Jesus who was named Christ.” So difficult was it to make an intelligible meaning of the sentence as it stands, that some later Armenian MSS inserted the substantive verb after the participle ‘having been betrothed’ (*խոսեցեալ է*).

When we turn to Syr^{cu} we read: “Jacob (note the omission here too of δέ) begat Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, who bare Jesus Christ.” The motive of this reading is obviously a desire to avoid the expression ‘the husband of Mary’, which was open to misinterpretation.

The reading of Syr^{sin} is as follows: “Jacob begat Joseph: Joseph to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin begat Jesus who was called Christ.” Whatever the origin of this reading may be—and I forbear to enter upon the controversy regarding the orthodoxy or unorthodoxy of its intention—it betrays the same unwillingness to speak of Joseph as ‘the husband of Mary’: so that no doubt remains that the Old Syriac Version contained the words which I have italicised in my rendering of the Armenian. The Armenian Version is fully accounted for on the supposition that the words were first translated from the Syriac and then corrected by the Greek, the italicised phrase being perhaps allowed to remain as a safeguard against wrong deductions which might have been made from the words immediately preceding it.

Codices 346 and 556 of the Ferrar group, which once more appears in combination with Old Syr. and Arm., read ‘Ιακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσῆφ ὃ μνηστευθεῖσα (-θησα) παρθένος Μαριὰμ ἐγέννησεν Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν. Accordingly I do not use this passage in support of the Old Syriac base of the Armenian Version, as it might be argued that in this case we had simply a conflation of two Greek readings. Yet I cannot but think that the explanation which I am able to offer is a more reasonable one; and in so far as this is so the passage is confirmatory of my position.

The Armenian Version of the Pauline Epistles.

It is time now to come to the examination of the Pauline Epistles in the Armenian Version. Here our enquiry is hampered by a difficulty which at first sight might seem insuperable. No MS, or fragment of a MS, so far as we know, contains what might, in contrast to the Peshito, be called an Old Syriac Version of these Epistles. Yet the case is not so hopeless as it appears.

For, in the first place, the analogy of the Gospels suggests the possibility that such an Old Syriac Version once existed, and that the Peshito is the result of its revision by the aid of Greek MSS. If this be the case, we may assume that much of the Old Syriac still remains in the Peshito, either because it was felt to be a sufficiently accurate rendering of the Greek, or because its aberrations were not recognised and so escaped the hand of the corrector.

Again, the Homilies of Aphrahat contain many quotations from these Epistles. They often differ widely from the Peshito Version, and so support the suggestion that an earlier Syriac Version lay before the writer.

But, further, the existence of an Old Syriac Version is no longer a matter of conjecture: for the recent publication (Venice, 1893) by the Mechitarists of S. Lazzaro of a Latin translation of S. Ephraim's Commentary on the Pauline Epistles has enabled Western scholars to see that the Syriac text on which S. Ephraim commented differed considerably from that of the Peshito. This Commentary, which is preserved only in an Armenian translation, was printed at Venice in 1836, but it has had to wait until now to take its place among the materials of N.T. criticism.

I shall make use of the evidence of S. Ephraim's Commentary, as occasion may serve, in the following pages. But I must utter two words of warning in regard to it. In the first place, but little reliance can be placed upon the Latin translation: for not only does it shew a constant tendency to paraphrase, but also the Latin Vulgate has throughout been in the hands of the translator, and he has again and again accommodated his translation to it, so that a completely erroneous idea is given in many places of the text which S. Ephraim used. And, again, an exactly similar method of

translation has vitiated the Armenian itself: for the Armenian translator of the Syriac frequently reproduced the *ipsissima verba* of his own Armenian Vulgate: and therefore we must constantly be on our guard against the danger of assigning to S. Ephraim what is nothing else than the text of the Armenian Version. We shall escape from this peril only if we refuse to found an argument on any reading, the Armenian words of which correspond exactly with the language of the Armenian Version. If, however, we use the Commentary with due caution, we may extract from it evidence of high importance for the study of the text of the Pauline Epistles¹.

Let us commence our examination with some passages in the Epistle to the Romans, where the Armenian Version challenges our attention. The first which we shall notice will serve to shew the kind of help which sometimes comes indirectly from S. Ephraim's Commentary.

1. Ro iii. 2 πρῶτον μὲν [γὰρ] ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ.

Arm. "First because the oracles of God became trustworthy" (*Հաւասարիմ եղեն*). This is obviously a mistranslation of the Greek: but it would seem that the Armenian translator was not the first to perpetrate it. In the Commentary of S. Ephraim we read as follows: "If God requireth the circumcision of the heart, much every way was established, that is, became trustworthy, *the word of God*." It is not possible from this to reconstruct S. Ephraim's text with certainty: but we can see that he rendered *ἐπιστεύθησαν* in a similar manner, taking *τὰ λόγια* as its subject. The explanatory comment 'that is, became trustworthy' is probably added by his Armenian translator from a reminiscence of his own Bible.

It is possible that the Armenian rendering is directly derived from the Greek; but if we have ground for supposing that the

¹ Three important articles of Dr Zahn, dealing with S. Ephraim's text as evidenced by this Commentary, appeared in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* (Leipzig, Sept. 6, Oct. 6 and 13, 1893). Dr J. H. Bernard, of Dublin, also published an interesting discussion of it in the *Guardian* (May 9, 1894). Unfortunately both these scholars had access only to the Latin translation; so that in several instances they have been led astray in points of detail.

Armenian Version of these Epistles rests ultimately on a Syriac base, it is not unreasonable to think that the first translator was led astray by the Syriac at this point. In Gal ii. 7 ἐπιστεύθη is rendered quite correctly by Հաւաստացեալ, ‘was entrusted.’

2. Ro v. 8 συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός.

Arm. “God manifested (*յայտնեաց*) his love to (or in) us.”

In Eph^{comm} we read: “In this above all he shewed his love, which was towards us.” The word for ‘shewed’ (*ցոյց*) proves that we are not here dealing with a mere reminiscence of his own Bible on the part of S. Ephraim’s Armenian translator. The Peshito helps us to regain the Old Syriac; for it reads: ܪահա ܪահի
ծավա ռահա ռովէ, “Here God manifesteth (or sheweth) his love, which was towards us.”

3. Ro vii. 21 Εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται.

Arm. “So then I find the law of him who wisheth (*այնորիկ*
որ կամիցին) to do in me the good, and to me the evil is present.”

This is not very intelligible: I believe that it is the result of an attempt to bring into nearer correspondence with the Greek what was originally a translation from the Syriac.

The Armenian of Eph^{comm} is at this point sufficiently different from the Armenian Vulgate to be of unassailable worth as a witness to S. Ephraim’s own text. It reads: “I see then a law, which wisheth to perfect in me something good, that which is hard to my will, because it is in readiness to do the evil.”

The Peshito reading is strange, but it helps to explain some of the difficulties in Eph^{comm}.

Հետո ու առ ասաւ յաւ Հաջա լիւ Տա բա ասաւ
. Ա ո առ Հետո ամսա յաւ Ա ո ամսա յաւ . Ա ո ամսա յաւ

“I find then the law, that it agrees with my mind which wisheth to do good; because evil is nigh to me.”

The Armenian is not quite like the Syriac, according to either testimony: but it is difficult to believe that it could have come into existence quite independently of it.

4. Ro xi. 35 ἡ τις προέδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ;

Arm. Ա առնուցու փոխարէն 'ի նմանէ.

“....and should receive in return from him.”

This is at once explained by the Peshito: առն ստ, “and so received from him.” Eph^{comm} gives us no help here.

We pass on to consider some passages in the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

5. 1 Co i. 10 οὐα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες.

There is no difficulty whatever in translating this quite literally into Armenian: and yet the Armenian Version reads, “that ye all have the same word” (**զի զնոյն բան ունիցիք ամենիքեան**).

Now S. Ephraim gives us **զի զի բան կալջիք դուք ամենիքեան**, “that ye all have the one word.” This cannot be due to a reminiscence on the part of the Armenian translator of his Commentary; for, besides other differences, there is a different word used for ‘have.’

All is clear when we see the reading of the Peshito: **أَعْلَمُ أَنْتُمْ بِهِ مُؤْمِنُونَ**, “that there be one word to all of you.”

6. 1 Co i. 12 ὅτι ἔκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει· Ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παῦλος· Ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλώ· Ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ· Ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ.

Arm. “that each of you saith: I am of Paul; and another, I of Apollos; and another, I of Kephas; and another, I of Christ.”

Here there is plainly some confusion: ‘each of you’ is inappropriate when followed by ‘and another.’ The explanation is clear when we read in the Peshito: “that there is of you that saith, I am of Paul; and there is that saith, I am of Apollos; and there is that saith, I am of Kephas; and there is that saith, I am

of Christ." S. Ephraim only gives the passage paraphrastically, weaving it into his Commentary: but yet the occurrence of the words 'some of you say' and 'others say' is sufficient to shew that he had some such reading as we find in the Peshito. May we not assume that this Syriac expansion lay before the first Armenian translator, and that subsequently his work was corrected by the Greek only so far as the substitution of 'each of you saith' for the opening words 'there is of you that saith' (or 'some of you say'); and that the remaining clauses were left, as helpful to the interpretation of the passage, the logical confusion newly introduced not being felt by the corrector? Indeed, I cannot think of any other possible explanation of the phenomena.

7. 1 Co iv. 3 ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἔστιν ὅτα νόφ' ὑμῶν ἀνακριθῶ ἢ ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας.

Arm. . . . կամ բնաւ իսկ 'ի մարդկանէ, "... or at all indeed by man."

This strange rendering is explained by the Syriac of the Peshito: ուշ ու եւ ու, "or by any son of man." Ephraim attests this reading by the words, "or at all by a son of man" (և կամ բնաւ ամենեւին յորդւոյ մարդոյ), where two words for 'at all' are found, the first of which is that used in the Armenian Version¹.

8. 1 Co iv. 12 f. καὶ κοπιῶμεν ἐργαζόμενοι τὰς ἴδιας χερ-
σίν· λοιδορούμενοι εὐλογοῦμεν, διωκόμενοι ἀνεχόμεθα, δυσφημού-
μενοι παρακαλοῦμεν.

Arm. "And we laboured with our hands: they reviled us, we blessed; they persecuted, we endured; they blasphemed, we besought."

Note, first, that there is one verb only for *κοπιῶμεν* ἐργαζόμε-
νοι. Secondly, *ἴδιας* is expressed less emphatically—'our' instead
of 'our own.' Thirdly, the passive participles have disappeared.

With regard to the first point, we find two verbs in the Peshito; but there is only one in Ephraim, 'we worked'
(գործեցաք), and this is not the same as 'we laboured'

¹ The Aethiopic Version has 'apud hominem mortalem.'

(աշխասիցը) of the Armenian Version. The second point is what we should expect from a rendering of پشتو (Pesh.). But the third point is still more interesting. To find its explanation we need only to compare the text of the Peshito:

هَمْسِرُونَ لَمْ يَسْتَعْذِنُونَ لَمْ يَسْتَعْذِنُونَ
هَمْسِرُونَ لَمْ يَسْتَعْذِنُونَ لَمْ يَسْتَعْذِنُونَ

"They revile us, and we bless: they persecute us, and we endure: they blaspheme us, and we beseech from them."

Dr Zahn¹ has called attention to a number of passages in which Aphrahat in his citations from the Pauline Epistles differs considerably from the text of the Peshito. I here give three instances in which the Old Syriac, as represented by Aphrahat, explains peculiarities of the Armenian Version which the Peshito explains only in part or not at all. They suggest that if we had the whole of the Old Syriac text many other difficulties of the Armenian Version would be accounted for.

9. Ro xv. 1 τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων.

Arm. զակարութիւն ակարսցն, 'the infirmity of the infirm.' The Peshito like the Greek has words from different roots here: **رَكْلَةَ رَكْلَةَ**. But Aphrahat who cites this passage (Wr. p. 141) gives us **رَكْلَةَ رَكْلَةَ**, 'the infirmity of the infirm,' exactly as the Armenian. The Syriac word **رَكْلَةَ** might be read, according to the points (which are often omitted in early MSS), either as singular or as plural. Here then we have also the explanation of the singular of the Armenian Version.

10. 1 Co viii. 8 βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παρίστησι (v. l. παραστήσει) τῷ θεῷ.

Arm. "But meat maketh us not to stand before God" (**սոսքի Աստվածոյ ոչ կացուցանել**).

Aphr. (Wr. p. 308) reads:

رَكْلَةَ رَكْلَةَ لَمْ يَسْتَعْذِنُونَ لَمْ يَسْتَعْذِنُونَ

¹ Geschichte des NTlichen Kanons, II. 556 ff.

"that meats make us not to stand before God." This, except for the plural, is identical with the Armenian: but the Peshito is quite different.

11. 2 Co v. 10 τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσηται ἔκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἄ ἐπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον.

Arm. "For to all of us to present ourselves (or to come to be face to face) it remains before the judgment-seat of Christ: that there-may-receive each one in his body, whatsoever he wrought before, whether good or bad." (քանզի ամենեցուն մեզ յանդիման լինել կայ առաջի ատենին Քրիստոսի. զի ընկալցի իւրաքանչեւր իւրով մարմնով զոր ինչ գործեաց յառաջ)

The Peshito offers us some help here. It has ~~מִתְחַדָּה~~ מִתְחַדָּה, 'we are to stand,' in place of φανερωθῆναι δεῖ: and it has 'in his body' in close connection with the preceding verb. But Aphrahat takes us further still, and explains the insertion of 'before.' He cites the passage twice in the same words (Wr. pp. 156, 447):

וְאַתֶּם לְמַעַם לֹא תְמַמָּה כִּי זָמַן דְּבָרֶךָ . אֲמַתְתָּה
וְאַתֶּם לְמַעַם לֹא תְמַמָּה כִּי זָמַן דְּבָרֶךָ . תְּמַתְתָּה
וְאַתֶּם לְמַעַם לֹא תְמַמָּה כִּי זָמַן דְּבָרֶךָ . גַּתְתָּה

"that to all of us (it remains) to stand before the judgment-seat of Christ; that there-may-receive each one in his body, whatsoever before he did, whether good or bad."

It would be quite easy to go on multiplying instances; but for our present purpose I do not think that it is at all necessary. I merely add a literal translation of some other passages of the Armenian Version, italicising the words to which I would direct attention, so that any one with a knowledge of Syriac may be able to satisfy himself further on the point.

Ro iv. 8 "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord doth not impute *his* sin."

Ro iv. 17 "In whom he believed, *that he maketh alive* the dead."

Ro vi. 13 "And *prepare* not your members...," and so below several times.

Ro viii. 28 "But we know that, to them that love God, *in every thing* he cooperates for good."

Ro xi. 26 "All Israel shall *live*." This rendering of $\sigma\omega\theta\eta\gamma\sigma\tauai$ is fairly frequent, though not by any means universal, and not at all necessitated (as in Syriac) by the vocabulary of the language. Cf. 1 Co iii. 15.

Ro xiii. 11 "And *know this* concerning the time."

1 Co v. 11 "With such an one not even to eat *bread*."

1 Co vi. 18 "is outside *his body*."

1 Co ix. 13 "Know ye not that they which work *in the Temple*, eat from *the Temple*."

1 Co ix. 15 "It is good for me rather to die, *and not that any one* should make my boasting void."

1 Co xiii. 3 "And if I give-to-eat ($\psi\omega\mu\iota\sigma\omega$) all my goods *to the poor*¹."

1 Co xiii. 8 f. "Whether tongues, they shall *be silent*...for we know *little from much*, and *little from much* we prophesy..."

2 Co x. 11 "Such as we are *by words of the letters*..."

I think that I may claim as the result of the foregoing investigation to have established at least a strong presumption in favour of an Old Syriac base underlying the Armenian Version both in the Gospels and in the Pauline Epistles. We have had warnings enough of the peril of hasty assertion in the region of N. T. textual criticism to make me unwilling to say more than this, until others have had an opportunity of testing the process by which this result has been reached, and until I myself may find time to carry the investigation further. If in the issue the view here propounded should be accepted as the true one, the Armenian Version will demand far more attention than it has hitherto received. For it will be recognised as a not unimportant witness to Old Syriac readings, where at present the direct testimony of Old Syriac MSS is altogether wanting.

In what I have written above, I have limited the range of my examples to the Gospels and the three longest Pauline Epistles.

¹ Cf. Aphr. Wr. 38.

But the enquiry will deserve to be pushed much further. I have reason for thinking that the Acts of the Apostles may prove a not unfruitful field of investigation, but it would be beside my present purpose to enter upon it here¹.

Moreover it is possible that by such an enquiry some side light may be thrown on the early Syriac Canon. For example, Dr Zahn² has directed our attention to the fact that S. Ephraim does not comment at all on the Epistle to Philemon. This, as he truly says, is more noteworthy than the absence of any quotation from this Epistle in Aphrahat. Now in reading this Epistle through in the Armenian Version I have not been able to observe any clear instance in which the Syriac of the Peshito explains a peculiar phrase of the translation. The Epistle is indeed but short, so that a negative argument of this kind has but little weight in itself. But the absence of a commentary on it in S. Ephraim makes it worth while to point out any corresponding phenomenon³.

Again, I cannot find in the Second Epistle of S. Peter any trace of a Syriac strain in the ancestry of the Armenian Version. Of other books of the New Testament, and of the Armenian Version of the Old Testament, I am not at present prepared to speak.

It will still remain a matter of interest to enquire whether the particular form of the Greek text by which the Armenian Version was revised and brought into its present state is capable of identification. Can it be shewn, for example,—to take up Mr Conybeare's theory in a modified form—that the Greek codex

¹ Dr Rendel Harris has called attention to an Armenian Commentary on the Acts, which contains extracts from a Commentary by S. Ephraim and clearly shews that he employed an Old Syriac Version of that Book. See *Four Lectures on the Western Text* (Camb. 1894), pp. 18 ff.

² *Geschichte des NTlichen Kanons*, II. 564 n.

³ Mr Burkitt has suggested to me that the omission of the Epistle to Philemon by S. Ephraim should be taken together with his acceptance of the Third Epistle to the Corinthians, on which he gives a full commentary. It is quite possible that the latter had in early times displaced the former, the recognised number of fourteen Epistles of S. Paul being thus maintained.

If this was the case in the Old Syriac Version which the earliest Armenian translators employed, we can thus explain the occurrence of 3 Corinthians in the Armenian Version: the replacement of Philemon would then date from the time of the revision by Greek codices. This would fully harmonise with the phenomenon of which I have spoken above.

used for the revision of the Pauline Epistles was a near relative of Codex H?

This question leads us on to make some enquiry as to the actual relation of the text of Codex H to that which is implied by the Armenian Version.

The Armenian Version and the ‘Euthalian text.’

We may now turn to the first leaf of M. Omont’s transcript of Codex H, and compare the seven verses which it contains with the rendering of them in the Armenian Version. I have tried to preserve the order of the words, as far as possible, in my English translation of the Armenian, and have italicised such words as I have supplied to complete the sense.

CODEX H (1 Co x. 23 ff.)¹.

23. Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν· ἀλλ’ οὐ πάντα συμφέρει. πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν· ἀλλ’ οὐ πάντα οἰκοδομεῖ.

24. μηδεὶς τὸ ἑαντοῦ ζητείτω, ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ ἐτέρου.

25. πᾶν τὸ ἐν μακέλλῳ πωλούμενον ἔσθιετε μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν.

26. τοῦ κυρίου γάρ ή γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς.

27. εἴ τις καλεῖ ὑμᾶς τῶν ἀπίστων καὶ θέλετε πορεύεσθαι, πᾶν τὸ παρατίθεμενον ὑμῖν ἔσθιετε μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν.

28. ἐὰν δέ τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ Τοῦτο ἱεροθύτον ἔστιν, μὴ ἔσθιετε δι’ ἐκείνου τὸν μηνύσαντα καὶ τὴν συνείδησιν.

29. συνείδησιν δὲ λέγω οὐχὶ τὴν ἐμαντοῦ ἀλλὰ τὴν τοῦ ἐτέρου...

THE ARMENIAN VERSION².

23. All things to me are possible, but not all things are profitable. All things to me are possible, but not all things edify.

24. Let no one the *things* of himself only seek, but also the things of his neighbour.

25. All that is sold in the shambles eat, and distinguish not because of conscience.

26. For the earth is the Lord’s with its fulness.

27. If any one call you of the unbelievers, and ye wish to go; all that is set before you eat, and distinguish not because of conscience.

28. But if any one shall say to you, This is sacrificed meat, eat not, on account of him who informed you and on account of conscience.

29. But conscience, I say, not his but the neighbour’s...

¹ I have not reproduced the peculiarities of spelling. In v. 27 *εἰ τις*, not *εἰ δέ τις*, is the reading of the first hand (see above, p. 66).

² The few variants recorded by Zohrab are quite unimportant, except that in v. 24 one ms at least omits ‘also.’

Let us first look for readings in which H and the Armenian both vary from the text of the better MSS as represented by Drs Westcott and Hort. Of these there is but one: viz. the insertion of *μοι* after *πάντα* twice in v. 23.

This reading is supported by Κ^cΗΚΛ al pler vg^{cle} syr^{utr} arm, as well as by some patristic authorities. Ephraim's Commentary does not attest it; but he only paraphrases at this point.

The coincidence of Arm. with H is of no help to us here, as *ex hypothesi* the reading, being attested by the Peshito, may have come into the Armenian originally from the Old Syriac.

Next let us examine the readings in which the Armenian varies both from H and from the text of Westcott and Hort.

(1) In v. 24 the Armenian inserts 'only' and 'also,' thus toning down the apparent severity of the precept.

How are we to account for these insertions? A few Greek cursives insert *καὶ* after *ἀλλὰ*, and the Peshito inserts **אֲךָ**, 'also.' But no Greek codex is cited for *μόνον*. It may however have stood at one time in Greek codices, for Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv. 7. 54), in citing this verse, gives us ...*μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ*...

Eph^{comm} runs as follows: "but not that we should seek the advantage of ourselves alone, but also that of our neighbours." This is of course a paraphrase; but it is to be noted that the word which I have translated 'alone' (*միայն*) is not the same as the 'only' (**և եթ**) of the Armenian Version. It is quite possible, then, that 'only' and 'also' were both in the Old Syriac¹, and that the **אֲךָ** of the Peshito is the relic of this reading.

It is not impossible that there is some connection between Clement, who often represents a 'Western' text, and the Old Syriac: but what the link may be is beyond our present purpose to enquire. It must suffice us now to say that our hypothesis of a Syriac base for the Armenian offers us a possible explanation of the variant which we have been considering.

(2) In v. 26 for *καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς* the Armenian reads "with (or in) its fulness" (*լրիւ իւրով*). No Greek MS has any variant to correspond to this. Eph^{comm} quotes the verse in exactly

¹ 'Only' is read by the Arabic Version (Erp. and Polygl.).

the same words as the Armenian Version: so that we cannot be sure that we have independent testimony here. But the Peshito explains the variant by its reading 'in its fulness.'

If this instance of correspondence between the Armenian and the Syriac stood alone, it might be taken to be a mere repetition of the Armenian Version of Ps xxiii. (xxiv.) 1, where the words are the same as here. But, after what we have already seen, it is more probable that it is a remnant of the old translation from the Syriac.

Lastly, we notice that there is one variant of H which is not recognised either by the Armenian or by Westcott and Hort.

In v. 29 H reads *ἐμαυτοῦ* (for *ἴαυτοῦ*), and Tischendorf cites in support of it only three cursives (31, 37, 73). '*ἴαυτοῦ*' was undoubtedly a difficult reading to a scribe or a translator who did not understand the indefinite use of the word which enabled it to be employed of the first, second or third person. The Armenian rendering 'his' is shewn by the context to be wrong. We find several other readings or renderings. The Peshito has 'your (pl.)'; Cod. Clar. (D₂) has *σεαυτοῦ* with *syrphilox* latt sah cop. But the Old Syriac, as attested by Ephraim's Commentary, had 'my,' which may imply the *ἐμαυτοῦ* which we find in H: but it might also be a rendering of *ἴαυτοῦ*, as interpreted by the words which immediately follow: "for why should my liberty," &c.

It is quite possible that the Armenian Version at first had 'my' from the Old Syriac; and that this was altered into 'his' with a view to a closer correspondence to a Greek MS which had (as the majority of Greek MSS have) *ἴαυτοῦ*. But in any case this reading of the Armenian Version cannot have come from H or from any Greek MS which agreed at this point with H.

Our examination, then, of the first seven verses which M. Omont has given us from Codex H does not point us to any closer connection of the Armenian Version with H than with other trustworthy Greek codices of the Pauline Epistles. On the contrary, we have seen one clear example which points in the opposite direction.

Another interesting passage for comparison is afforded by some of the newly recovered verses of Cod. H (1 Co xi. 17-19)¹.

CODEX H.

17. τοῦτο δὲ παραγγέλλων οὐκ ἐπαινῶ, ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τὸ κρείττον ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ ἡπττον συνέρχεσθε.

18. πρώτον μὲν γὰρ συνερχομένων
ύμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν
ύμῖν ὑπάρχειν, καὶ μέρος τι πιστεύω.

19. δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἰρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν
εἶναι, ἵνα καὶ οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται
ἐν ὑμῖν.

ARMENIAN VERSION.

17. But this I command, not as though I should praise: for not to the better, but to the worse (*or base*), do ye advance.

18. First, when in one place ye assemble in the church, I hear that divisions exist among you; and a little have I believed it.

19. But even divisions are about to be among you, that they which are approved among you may be manifested.

Here we observe several peculiarities in the Armenian Version of which Cod. H gives us no explanation.

(*ուստի ուշադիր լին*), where ~~ուստի~~ corresponds to the *որպէս* *թէ*, ‘as though,’ of the Armenian.

(2) A more striking difference is found in the word 'advance' in the same verse. The Aethiopic Version seems to contain Old Syriac elements in many places. It is interesting to note Bode's translation of this clause²: 'quia non proceditis in id quod melius est, sed potius in id quod uilius est.'

The Peshito is strange, but contains the same idea of 'advance':

• ଅନୁମତି ଦାତାଙ୍କ ପରିବହନ ରାଜ୍ୟ ପାଇଁ
• ଅନୁମତି ଦାତାଙ୍କ ପରିବହନ

"Because ye went not forwards, but to littleness ye descended."

¹ For the exact text of H, see above p. 53. I have indicated by the brackets in v. 17 that we cannot be certain that H had not the alternative reading παραγγέλων ἐπαινῶν.

N. T. Aethiopici interpretis...in Latinum transtulit C. K. Bodius, Brunsuigae, 1753.

The Armenian of Ephraim's Commentary is instructive here: "For not to the better forwards did ye advance therein, but to the base (or little) ye descended and were brought down by those things." Here the phrase 'to the better' is exactly in the words of the Armenian Version (*՚ի լաւ անդր*), and probably is introduced from that source. When it is eliminated, we see that Ephraim's text was probably the same as that of the Peshito.

It would seem then that the Armenian Vulgate here represents a correction of the earliest Armenian translation from the Syriac so as to bring in the phrase 'to the better' from the Greek: and that the word 'advance' has a Syriac origin. The Syriac

أَمْرَأَنَل probably represented the Greek *eis τὸ κρείττον*. The Syriac phrase أَمْرَأَنَل أَمْرَأَنَل was rendered by the Armenian 'advance' (*նկրտիք*), so that, when 'to the better' was afterwards inserted, *eis τὸ κρείττον* obtained a double representation.

(3) In v. 18 'in one place' has no attestation, except that Theodoret has *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* here: but this seems to be introduced from v. 20. The Arm. has the same word for 'divisions' (or 'heresies') in this and the following verse.

(4) A further peculiarity in the Armenian Version is the rendering 'are about to be' (or 'to arise,' *լինելոց են*) in the place of *δεῖ...εἰσαται*.

The Peshito again offers an exact parallel: أَمْرَأَنَل أَمْرَأَنَل—the fully expressed future, 'about are even contentions that they should be.'

In these verses, then, I think that there can be no doubt that the main element which differentiates the Armenian Version from the text of the ordinary Greek codices is a Syriac element. Nor is there any point which links the Armenian to Codex H rather than to any other Greek Codex.

It is now time that we should consider some of the arguments presented by Mr Conybeare in support of his own view.

Mr Conybeare himself was struck at the outset of his textual enquiry with "the paradoxical fact that two texts, each claiming

to be transcribed from the copy made by Pamphilus which lay at Caesarea, are quite different texts, so that, if one is the text of Pamphilus, then the other cannot be¹." Any but a courageous investigator would have been deterred by these untoward appearances. But Mr Conybeare found, by the aid of Bousset's tables of readings, (1) that there was a distinct Euthalian element in the Armenian Version, and (2) that the Armenian was more true than Codex H itself to the Euthalian text, and accordingly *ex hypothesi* to the Codex of Pamphilus.

Accepting, provisionally, for the sake of our argument, Bousset's theory that the Codex of Pamphilus is represented in the main by Codex H, the corrector of Codex Sinaiticus (H^c), and the upper writing of Codex rescriptus Porfirianus Chioensis (Euthal^{cod}), let us look at the chief points of the proof which Mr Conybeare offers us.

1. Out of 33 agreements between H and H^c, 14, he tells us, cannot be tested by the Armenian. In 12 of the 19 which remain the Armenian supports their witness. After examining these Mr Conybeare says (p. 256): "Thus we have 12 cases of well marked and highly characteristic readings in which the Arm. = H^c." But on examining these readings I find 9 of the 12 in the Peshito. This does not prove that they are Old Syriac readings, though this may quite possibly be the case: but it does make us hesitate to speak of them as "highly characteristic" of the Codex of Pamphilus. Of the remaining 3, one is the reading of the great majority of Greek codices ($\lambda\alpha\mu\psi\alpha$ 2 Co iv. 6); another is $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ δόκιμος for δόκιμός $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ (2 Co x. 18), again with nearly all Greek codices—a variant moreover where the order of the words in a version is of little weight; while in the case of the third, Xριστῷ Ἰησοῦ as against Xριστῷ alone (Col i. 28), we have a considerable Greek attestation, and, while the Peshito gives us (practically alone) Ἰησοῦ Xριστῷ, the Philoxenian Syriac has Xριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

Thus the main proof of a common base for Arm. and H^c breaks down entirely.

Nor does the theory fare better when we examine the "five test cases" (p. 257) in which "the Arm. adheres to the Pamphilian hand of H, whereas H forsakes it." For of these the first three

¹ *Journal of Philology*, loc. cit. p. 252.

are Peshito readings and are found in most Greek codices. The fourth is disqualified as a witness; for the Armenian could not represent the distinction between *ἴνα σωφρονίζουσιν* and *ἴνα σωφρονίζωσιν* (Tit ii. 4). The fifth, *τοῦ ἀօράτου θεοῦ* (2 Co iv. 4) is apparently not an Old Syriac reading; for both Ephraim in his Commentary and the Peshito omit *ἀօράτου*. It is found in N^cLP and 23 cursives (Tisch.). This combination is worthy of attention; but it is by itself a slender foundation for the theory which we are now discussing.

I do not think that I need follow Mr Conybeare further. I have examined the readings which he has himself put forward as "highly characteristic" and as "test cases," and I have found them wholly insufficient to support his position. I do not deny that there may be a connection between the Greek codices by which the Armenian Version was corrected and Codex H or the Codex Pamphili. What I assert is that a connection has not yet been proved, and that, in any future endeavours to prove it, all readings of the Armenian Version which have Syriac attestation—which may conceivably be Old Syriac attestation—must be rigidly excluded.

I cannot leave this discussion, which has necessarily involved some adverse criticism, without expressing my sincere gratitude to Mr Conybeare for his discovery of fresh materials and for the stimulus which is given by all that he writes. He will, I trust, pardon me, if I sometimes welcome his facts without accepting the conclusions which he draws from them.

CHAPTER VI.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS.

WE may now attempt to bring together the chief results of the foregoing investigations, so far as they throw any light upon Euthalius and his work; and at the same time we may indicate certain directions in which further research is greatly needed.

Certain Greek codices of the Pauline Epistles and of the Acts and the Catholic Epistles are furnished with Prologues, with Tables of Old Testament quotations, and with Tables of chapter summaries prefixed to individual books. In the margin of the text of these codices we find references to the quotations and a numeration which corresponds to the Tables of chapter summaries.

The bulk of this apparatus varies greatly in different codices. Few MSS are altogether lacking in such adornments. Few, again, present us with what we have enumerated in its completeness: the Tables of quotations, for example, are but seldom met with. On the other hand, many MSS have added the Pseudo-Athanasian summaries, and some are loaded with still heavier additions.

The Prologue to the Pauline Epistles and those to the Acts and the Catholic Epistles are quite plainly all from the hand of the same writer. But this writer does not tell us his name: and in many of the MSS the titles prefixed to the Prologues are vague and give us no further light¹. Many codices however prefix the name of Euthalius. Some of them describe him simply as 'Deacon': others call him 'Bishop of Sulca.' Moreover some MSS in the titles of the Prologues to the Acts

¹ These titles are carefully discussed by von Dobschütz, who has gathered together a good deal of ■■■ evidence regarding them: *Centr. f. Bibl.* x. 63 f.

and Catholic Epistles give the name of the recipient of this portion of his work as 'Athanasius Bishop of Alexandria.'

In harmony with this we find that in these Prologues the writer addresses himself to one whom he calls his 'brother Athanasius'; whereas in his Prologue to the Pauline Epistles, which he had previously edited, he had dedicated his work to a 'most honoured Father' who is not further described.

Now it is not possible to explain the statements contained in these titles as a mere deduction from the contents of the Prologues themselves. 'Athanasius Bishop of Alexandria' might indeed be so accounted for; and the designation of the writer himself as a bishop might be held to follow from his addressing Athanasius as his 'most beloved' and 'most honoured brother.' But the name of Euthalius admits of no such easy explanation; nor can we thus account for the mysterious designation of his see. The very fact that an unknown man, described as the bishop of an unknown place, should be offered to us by the MSS as the author of the work is in favour of the trustworthiness of the tradition which they preserve. For it is not often that works, originally anonymous, come to be assigned to writers of whom nothing whatever is known. Eminent persons, as a rule, are chosen to act as sponsors to the waifs and strays of literature.

Accordingly we accept the tradition that Euthalius Bishop of Sulca was the author of the work in question: and we may reasonably follow Zacagni in explaining the title 'Deacon,' which some MSS apply to him, by supposing that he still held that subordinate office when he dedicated the earlier portion of his work to the unnamed person whom he addresses as 'most honoured Father.'

As regards the much canvassed question of the date of Euthalius, our enquiries have enabled us to remove certain historical difficulties which have hitherto encompassed it. We have seen reason for believing that in the year 396 A.D. his work was subjected to some kind of revision, apparently with the view of reducing it to a more serviceable compass. This new edition appears to belong to Caesarea and to be the workmanship of a writer named Evagrius.

It is therefore not unreasonable to go back at least twenty-

five years from this point for the date of the original edition. Thus we are brought within the lifetime of S. Athanasius, who died in 372: and, of course, so far as this consideration is concerned, we are at liberty to go back earlier still. An upper limit is provided by the fact that Euthalius makes citations from works of Eusebius which were written c. 323. We have no clear evidence to enable us to fix the date more precisely in the half-century which is thus marked out for us.

There is, however, one indication which would seem to point us to an earlier rather than a later date within this period. We found it exceedingly probable that a system of chapter numbering in the Acts, which has been introduced quite independently by very early hands into Codices **N** and **B**, and appears also in a slightly altered form in the best MSS of S. Jerome's Vulgate, is ultimately based on the Euthalian chapters and subdivisions. It is not the Euthalian system in its integrity, but a modification (whether accidental or intentional) of that system. It probably stood in the margin of some Greek codex at Caesarea, anterior in date to **N** and **B**: and it is just possible—though at present we need to speak with caution on this point—that S. Jerome himself is responsible for our finding it in the Vulgate MSS.

This consideration inclines us to push back the date of Euthalius, in order to allow time for the extended use at so early a period of his chapter numbers in a modified form; and thus we are led to place him provisionally not later than 350 A.D.¹

It has hitherto been customary to attribute to Euthalius an elaborate system of stichometrical calculations, giving the exact compass in measured lines (*στίχοι*) not only of the text of the Books which he edited, but also of his own Prologues and Tables. But we have seen one clear instance in which it is impossible to assign certain of these calculations to Euthalius

¹ I have not thought it necessary to reproduce the statements of Armenian chronologers with regard to Euthalius, which are collected by Father Carekin (*Cat. of Anc. Arm. Translations*, p. 174) and are translated by Mr Conybeare (*Journ. of Phil. ut supra*, p. 251). They occur as notes on the reign of Arcadius and Honorius, and are obviously based on the Prologues and on the *Martyrium Pauli* which were found in the Armenian Bibles.

himself (p. 35); and in another case the credit for having made them is expressly claimed by a later writer of the name of Evagrius. Moreover there is nothing whatever in the descriptions which Euthalius gives us of the scope of his own work to suggest that he took any interest at all in this kind of stichometry.

The true Euthalian stichometry, or *colometry*, as it is now more conveniently termed, is his division of the text into *cola*, or short sentences, as an aid to intelligent reading. It was this colometrical arrangement which he regarded as so novel and so important a feature in his edition. I have not entered upon the subject of colometry in this Essay. It is a topic which needs a full investigation. It has been suggested by several critics—and their view is almost certainly correct—that there is a connection of a close kind between the colometry of Codex H and that represented, less perfectly and in different ways, by Codices Claramontanus and Boernerianus. The only contribution which I am here able to offer to this subject consists in the additional evidence given by the restored pages of Codex H, which is our only direct witness to the Euthalian arrangement of the text.

While it is reasonable to think that Codex H preserves to us the *cola* of Euthalius more faithfully than we can hope to find them preserved anywhere else, yet we may be allowed to question whether it gives us an exact representation of the external appearance of his edition. Its enormous letters involve the constant turning of a line in order to complete the *colon*. It seems more likely that in the original codex each *colon* would, as a rule, occupy a single line. If this were so, the general aspect of the page might rather resemble a page of Codex B in the Psalms, where the size of the letters permits of two columns of about twenty-six letters each, so that the *cola* are not very frequently broken. But it is possible that the Codex of Euthalius contained but one column to the page, and was of far less splendid a character than either Codex H or Codex B.

We have been led by reasons of quite a different kind to regard Codex H as only giving us a much modified form of the Euthalian edition: and in spite of the Euthalian colouring of its interesting colophon, we cannot doubt its own explicit testimony which connects it with the Evagrian and Caesarean line of tradition.

This conclusion is of great importance when we come to enquire as to the character of the text which Euthalius used. Had we, indeed, been able to discover the locality in which he lived and worked, we should have had some presumptive evidence as to his text. But, as it is, we are at present left wholly in the dark. We know that Codex H and certain other Euthalian codices offer us a text which has undergone revision in the Library of Caesarea. But how great a measure of correction was needed in order to bring the original text of Euthalius into harmony with the Codex of Pamphilus, or with what care the revision was actually made, we have not at present the means of judging. Nor can we say whether any existing Euthalian codex contains a text which is independent of this Caesarean revision.

It is possible that some light may hereafter be thrown upon the question by the citations made by Euthalius in his Prologues and Tables of quotations, where the reviser's hand may perhaps have failed to interfere. Thus, to take a single example, in the Table prefixed to the Pauline Epistles (Z. 553) we read :

ΔΔΠ. κε'. Ναοὺμ καὶ Ἡσαίου τῶν προφητῶν α'。
‘Ως ὠράτοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων τὰ ἀγαθά.

Zacagni does not tell us what reading the Reg.-Alex. has at this point in its continuous text: but Tischendorf cites from his “Euthal^{cod}” the insertion of *τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην* after *πόδες*. This insertion is supported by \aleph^c D₂KLP vg syrr arm Chrys. But it is absent from \aleph^* ABC sah cop Clem Or. Again, *τὰ* is supported by $\aleph^*D_2^{bc}$ KL Clem Chrys Euthal^{cod}: but it is omitted by \aleph^c ABCD₂*P Or.

In other cases the citations in this Table have quite a different kind of attestation, and several times they are on the side of \aleph^c as against \aleph^* .

But it would be a waste of labour to attempt to argue from examples of this kind until we get a more satisfactory recension of the Euthalian apparatus than is to be found in Zacagni's edition.

Mr Conybeare's interesting suggestion that the text of Euthalius is preserved for us in its purest form by the Armenian Version we have been obliged to reject. Our enquiry into the

origin of this Version has shewn us that there are Syriac elements of great antiquity contained in it, and that it is worthy of a most careful study. But until these Syriac elements have been noted and set aside, it can give us no trustworthy evidence as to the character of the Greek codices which have had so large a share in making it what it now is. There still remains a possibility that the Euthalian apparatus—perhaps in its modified Caesarean shape—was introduced into the Armenian Version by the great fifth century translators: and, if this were so, we might expect to find in the text of the Version traces of the later form of Euthalian text which is represented by Codex H. But at present this can be no more than a guess, and even if it proved true it would be of more interest as a contribution to the history of the Armenian Version than for any fresh aid which it could afford for the reconstruction of that particular stage of the Euthalian text.

But while we may not speak of the “Euthalian Text” as if it were a known quantity available for the purposes of textual criticism, yet it is to be noted that the presence or absence of portions of the Euthalian apparatus in Greek MSS must form an important clue in the hitherto almost unattempted task of the classification of the later codices of the Acts and Epistles. Accordingly we may assert with confidence that one of the next steps to be taken in the textual criticism of this portion of the New Testament must be a critical edition of the work of Euthalius himself, and of the multitudinous supplements with which it has been adorned or disfigured by his successors.

APPENDIX.

COLLATION OF THE PSEUDO-ATHANASIAN SYNOPSIS.

APPENDIX.

COLLATION OF THE PSEUDO-ATHANASIAN SYNOPSIS.

THIS Synopsis has attracted a good deal of attention of late. In order to shew this I need only give the following references : Zahn, *Geschichte des NTlichen Kanons*, ii. 302—318 ; Lagarde, *Septuaginta-Studien*, ii. 59 ff. ; Klostermann, *Analecta zur Septuaginta*, 79—112. It is unnecessary for me to enter into the history of its text, except so far as to cite the words of Montfaucon with regard to the codex from which the *editio princeps* (1600, *Ex Officina Commeliniana*) was printed :

Ne omittamus ea quae de codice, unde haec Synopsis prodiit, habet Felckmannus. Usae sunt operae, inquit, textu huius Synopseos Graece descripto ex uetusto et miris ductibus constante codice, quem ex Bibliotheca uiri clarissimi Petri Neuelei Doschii curauit uir Ampliss. D. Bongarsius, quem cum non in omnibus descriptor assequitur sit, quidquid erit discrepantiae notandum duxi. Quamquam essent non pauca, quae de interpretatione moneri poterant: imò locorum quoque nonnullorum in ipso ueteri codice conjecturae possent afferri, quae tamen omnia breuitatis causa, et quod docti per se ipsi in hoc longe optimi monitores sibi erunt omitto. Quorsum autem euaserit codex ille memoratus a Felckmanno ignoratur. Codicem Synopseos aliquem nec uidi, nec alicubi exstare didici¹.

To this I need only add that Dr James announced in 1892 that he had found a ms of this Synopsis in the Library of Eton College : *Testament of Abraham* (Texts and Studies, ii. 2), p. 7 note.

As portions of the Synopsis constantly find their way into Euthalian codices, I have thought it worth while to give here a collation of this ms. The weariness of this somewhat unprofitable

¹ *Athanas.* ed. Ben. 1698, p. viii : Migne, *P. G.* xxviii. 15. Felckmann's words, together with a few variants from the ms, will be found on p. 84 of the Appendix to the Commelinian edition.

task has been relieved by the thought that my work may be of some service to Herr von Dobschütz, who has promised to give us a study of the book.

It appeared to me that it would be most convenient to scholars that I should collate the ms with Migne's text, reprinted from Montfaucon in the fourth volume of S. Athanasius's works (*Patrol. Graeca*, xxviii. 283—438). It can thus be used also by those who have Montfaucon's edition, the pages of which I have given: whereas, had I based the collation on Montfaucon's or the Commelinian text, it would have been useless to the many who have Migne's reprint.

An examination of the collation will shew that this is the ms from which the book was originally printed. Its marginal corrections have been taken into the text; and obvious blunders have frequently been eliminated, though some have been allowed to remain¹.

The ms is a stout quarto, written by hands of the end of the 14th or beginning of the 15th century. Portions of it were written by Ducas the Notary for John of Ragusa. Of him a 16th century hand has written in the margin of p. 145: 'Hic fuit Episcopus Argensis, theologus ordinis Dominicanorum, quem Felix V pp ob singularem eruditionem spectatamque uitae sanctimoniam tituli S. Sixti Cardinalem creavit. Dominicanorum Basiliensium bibliothecam Graecis codicibus locupletauit.'

Compare the notice of him in De Mas Latrie, *Trésor de Chronologie*, 1204: 'Jean Dominici, Florentin, frère prêcheur, archev. de Raguse, pr. card. de S. Sixte, légat en Hongrie et en Bohême; m. 1420, ou plutôt 1419.'

The ms was presented to Mr Huggett, the Librarian of Eton College, in the 18th century, by Dr John Henry Mauclerc. It had been in the possession of the Mauclercs of Vitry since 1665.

¹ The word πέπονθεν (Mg. 421 C=Montf. 196 D) has a vertical stroke after the first syllable πε: this has been cancelled and another has been placed after the syllable πον. A line is also drawn in the margin at this place. On referring to the Commelinian edition we find that p. 128 ends with πεπον. It is probable that the codex was actually sent to the printer: but even if these marks were put in by Felckmann after the text had been printed, they would still go to prove the identity of our codex with that from which the *editio princeps* was made.

The following description will illustrate these statements and give the contents of the MS.

Codex Etonensis B. l. 5. 13.

On a fly-leaf: Codex hic ms. quem ex Victoriaco Campagniae asportavit Daniel Avus meus in Bataviam, & hinc in Angliam Patruus, Jacobus, hereditario jure venit ad me Joannem Henricum Mauclerc.

On p. 1, in the bottom margin, are the names of several former owners, partly erased:

Ioannis × × × × × × beneficio d. I. × × × × × 1550

F. N. Neuleti × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × ×

ex Libris Danielis Mauclerc Doctoris
medici Victoriacensis 1665

ex libris Jacobi Mauclerc M.D. 1700

ex Libris Joannis Henrici Mauclerc. M.D. 1748.

The Synopsis runs from p. 1 to p. 99, l. 2: ending with the words εἰς διαφύλαξιν:—

Then a red title follows: Ἰωσήπου· ἐκ τοῦ ὑπομνηστικοῦ. κεφ.
ρη. τίνα ἔστι τὰ μνημονεύμενα ἐν τῇ γραφῇ βιβλίᾳ ώς δύτα οὐχ
εὑρισκόμενα δέ.

Inc. Νάθαν καὶ ἀδδὼ (19 lines): expl. ἀμελεῖας ἀπώλοντο.

Then follows: (red title) Δωροθέου ἐπισκόπου τύρου· ἀνδρὸς
πνιφόρου καὶ μάρτυρος...Σύνοψις εἰς τὸν βίους καὶ τὰ τέλη τῶν
ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν προφητῶν.

Inc. Οὗτος ὁ προλεχθεὶς.... Expl. p. 129. ...ἐτάφη πόλει
ἀποθανών, with a red subscr. τέλος τῶν προφητῶν· ἥγουν τῆς
γενέσεως αὐτῶν· καὶ τῆς βιοτῆς, καὶ τῆς τελευτῆς. Then under
a red and black border: δοίκας νοτάριος, apparently in the same
hand as the preceding.

The Book has been broken up, apparently with a view to the convenience of the printers. At the bottom of p. 98 the two lines of p. 99 which are required to close the treatise are written afresh, and underneath them the note:

‘Sequitur in ms. Ἰωσήπου ἐκ τοῦ ὑπομνηστικοῦ...sequitur
deinde Δωροθεοῦ...’

pp. 125—128 are left blank.

p. 129. Σύνοψις χρονική ἀπὸ ἀδάμ τὴν ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα... ἔως τῶν χρόνων τῆς βασιλείας ἀλεξίου τοῦ κομιηνοῦ.

Inc. Ἀδάμ ὁ πρώτος ὑπὸ θεοῦ πλασθεὶς...

Expl. (p. 144). ...μέχρι καὶ νῦν σὺν θῷ διαρκούσῃ.

Then in the same hand: Καθολικοῦ διδασκάλου τῆς συνο'^δ φρᾶ ιω^{ον}, ὑπάρχει αὕτη ἡ βίβλος ἐγράφη γοῦν διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ δούκα νοτάριου.

The next section of the Book is in a different hand: but the watermark of the paper—a pair of scales—remains the same, and Ducas the Notary has written in the upper margin of p. 145 the following words:

Διδασκάλου καὶ καθολικοῦ τῆς συνο'. πρσ φρᾶ ιω^{ον}, ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς ῥαγουζίας ὑπάρχει ἡ βίβλος. δουκας νοτάριος.

p. 145. Title (red): συνοδικὸν ἐν ἐπιτομῇ ἀπάσας...ἔχον συνοδόν. μέχρι τῆς ὀγδοῆς οἰκουμενικῆς μεγάλης καὶ ἀγίας ὄντως συνοδού.

Inc. Σύνοδος θεία καὶ ἱερά...

Expl. (p. 183, l. 9). ἔξεπαιδεύθημεν ἀπαντες. The Book has been again broken at this point. The last nine lines have been copied on to p. 182; and are there followed by 'Explicit. Sequitur in ms. 'Επιστολὴ...τὸ ησύχιον; etc.'

The next piece begins on the same page (183) with a red title: ἐπιστολὴ συνοδικὴ τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πρς ἥμῶν σωφρονίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἱεροσολύμων ἐν ἡ κατὰ πάσης ἐστὶν αἱρέσεως.

Inc. Βαβαὶ βαβαὶ παμμακάριστοι, πῶς μοι φίλον νῦν τὸ ησύχιον.

Expl. p. 219. ἡ ὑπογραφή ἐρρωμένος ἐν κω' ὑπερεύχον μον· ἀγιώτατε περ' ἐν χω^ιν. ἀμήν.

p. 219, l. 3 (red): τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πρς ἡμῶν ἀναστασίου πριάρχου θεουπόλεως. περὶ πίστεως

Inc. Ἰστέον καὶ μὴ ἀγνοητέον....

At the beginning of p. 225 the hand again changes, and we have once more the writing of Ducas the Notary.

Expl. 239. ...λέγω δὴ ἐπὶ γένους παντὸς, φίλε χν.

p. 240 is blank.

p. 241 begins, in a fresh hand, σύνταγμα τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐν

νικαλα σύνοδον πραχθέντων. Inc. Τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀγίαν καὶ μεγάλην.... Expl. ἀγαπητὴ ἀδελφέ. τέλος τῶν πρακτικῶν τῆς πρώτης συνόδου. τῷ θεῷ χάρις.

p. 337. Another hand begins the Acts of the Council of Ephesus.

A new numbering begins at this page. The ms is henceforth foliated, not paginated, and is to the end in the hand of Ducas.

p. 257 v. Colophon: τέλος σὺν θεῷ τῆς βίβλου ταύτης τῶν πρακτικῶν τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς τρίτης συνόδου.

ἐτελειώθη γοῦν διὰ χειρὸς ἐμοῦ τοῦ ταπηνοῦ νοταρίου τῆς ἀγιωτάτης τοῦ θεοῦ μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας διὰ συνδρομῆς καὶ ἔξοδου τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου καὶ καθολικοῦ τῆς συνόδου ἵερωμονάχου φρᾶ ἰωάννου (then added) ἀπὸ τῆς ῥαγουζίας, (later) Ioannis hermyn beneficio I. Leon. Gastii.

COLLATION WITH MIGNE'S ATHANASIUS, VOL. IV, 283 FF.

[The figures in brackets are those printed in thick type by Migne. They give the pages of the later Benedictine edition (Patavii, 1777, tom. 2).

The references to the right are to Montfaucon's edition: where he retains the reading of the ms (apart from differences of accent or breathing) I have put an asterisk instead of a reference.]

Tit. Σύνοψις ἐπίτομος τῆς θείας γραφῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ νέας διαθήκης τοῦ ἀγίου καὶ μεγάλου Ἀθανασίου.

284 A (96) Χριστιανῶν] pr τῶν ¹	126 A
285 B ἐξ Ἀρμαθαὶ] pr ἦν	C
C (97) τοῦ μὲν πρώτου] + ὡς ἐξήγειρε Κύριος] om Κύριος	127 A
D Δαβιτικὸν] δαυιτικὸν ἐν Ἰσραὴλ] ἐν Ἰλῆμ ^{ιηλ'} (sic pr man)	*
	B

¹ The Books of the O. T. are lettered in the margin, from α (Gen) to κβ (Dan). The α however is placed against the first line of the treatise. The Twelve Prophets are one Book (ιη): so are 1, 2 Kings; 3, 4 Kings; 1, 2 Chron; 1, 2 Esdr. The Gospels are similarly numbered α—δ.

288	A	Αύσέτιδι] τῇ αύσίτιδι	C
		ἀμέμπτος] pr ἀληθινὸς	
C		ἐν Ἐλκεσαι] ἐνΚέσ Χοὺς] χουσί·	F
D		Ἄγγαίου] + τοῦ	
289	B	(98) Σιράχ] σηράχ	E
		Νεισᾶν] νεισᾶ	F
C		Βενιαμίν] βενιαμίμ Ναβονχοδονόσωρ] ναβονχοδονόσορ	*
		Ἀνανιὴλ] ἀννανιὴλ	
		Ἄστεὴλ] ἀστιὴλ	129 A
D		νιὸν Ἀβραάμ] νιὸν δᾶδ νιὸν ἀβραάμ	B
292	A	πεπληροφορημένων] πεπληρωφορημένων	C
		καὶ ὁ Λόγος] bis scriptum	
B		(99) δώδεκα] iβ	E
293	D	(100) συμφωνίαν] συμφωνείαν	131 B
		θεοφόρων] pr καὶ	
296	C	ηὐλόγησεν] εὐλόγησεν	F
297	B	(101) Μαμβρῆς] īαμβρῆς	132 F
C		καὶ σίκλοι, αψοε'] om ,αψοε'	133 A
D		λοιπὸν νόμιμα] λοιπὰ νόμιμα	B
300	A	συμπεραίνεται] συμπεραίνετε sed corr in marg	C
		(102) λευιτικῆς 2°] sic marg: txt λευικῆς	D
B		Διείληπται] διήλευπται	E
		ἢ χρίσις] + τοῦ	
C		μεγάλης νηστείας] + ἵν' ἐν τῷ οὕτῳ] οὕτως	F
D		μηρυκάται] μαρυκάται: et sic infra τὰ ὅμοια τούτῳ] τὰ ὅμοι τούτῳ ἴβις] ἴβης	134 B
301	A	ἀτταγᾶς] ἀτταγός	*
		χειμάρροις] χειμάρροις	D
		ἐν τι] ἐν τῇ τῇ	E
C		(103) Σουρισαδαῖ] σουρισαδέ	135 B
		Σωγάρ] σογάρ	
		χιλιάδες οδ' καὶ ἔξακόσιοι] add in marg ἐννέα	
		καὶ πεντήκοντα χιλιάδες καὶ τριακόσιοι	
D		χιλιάδες μβ' καὶ πεντακόσιοι] add in marg τεσ-	

- C
- σαράκοντα χιλιάδες καὶ πεντακόσιοι*
- Φαδασσούρ] φαδασούρ
τριακόσιοι] marg διακόσιοι
- 304 A 'Αμισαδαί] ἀμισαδέ
ό ἀριθμὸς 1º] sic marg: txt ὄριθος
Νεφθαλεὶμ] νεφθαεὶ^λ
έξακόσιαι] per contract script
- D (104) εἰς τὴν γῆν] τὴν supra lin e pr man
ό Φινεῆς ἀνέτρωσε] ὁ φινεὲς ἀνέτρησε
- 305 A Καταλαλήσας] sic marg: txt καταλήσας
έξακόσιαι] έξακοσιαιφ (sic)
- B ἐπαύριον] pr τῇ
Σοχὼθ, ἀπὸ Σοχὼθ] σοχὼθ ἀπὸ σοκχὼθ
Σεὶρ] σήρ
- C 'Εταβαθᾶ] ἐταμαθὰ tantum secundo loco
ἐστὶ Κάδες] ἐστὶ Κάδης
- 136 B
C
- 137 B
- 308 A (105) ἀναιρεθέντος] sic corr: txt ἀνερεθέντος
B θυγατέρες] θυγατέραις
C 'Ισαχἀρ] ἵσταχἀρ
Γαδδιδουδιῆλ] γαδδονδιῆλ
D βιβλίον] pr τὸ
- 309 A ἀναγινώσκεσθαι] ε in αι corr man rec
B (106) παραβαινούσιν] + αὐτόν
ἀπὸ 'Ρουβὶμ] διὰ ρουβὶμ
'Ιησοῦν] ν supra lin man rec
- 138 A
B
C
- 139 A
B
- C oύ πάντα] οὐ πάντως
ἐκάστους καιροὺς] ἐκάστου καιροὺς
D διαδεξάμενος] δαιξάμενος: αι in ε corr man rec
τόπον] sic marg: txt ποταμόν
τροπώσηται] τροπώσεται
- 312 A 'Ισάχαρ] ἵσταχἀρ 'Ασηρ] ἀσσῆρ
B καὶ ἐν 'Εδραεὶμ] καὶ ἐγένετο δραεὶμ
C (107) Γαζέρ] γαξέρ 'Αθαφοὺθ] ἀταφοὺθ
Μαμβρὸθ] μαμβρὼθ
Χαρμὲλ] χερμὲλ
- 313 A Ταμεγἀρ] σαμεγἀρ
ἔκρινεν τὸν 'Ι.] ἔκρινε τον i.
- 140 B
C
D
E

B	γέγονε μετά] γέγονε κατὰ ἡξίωσεν] ἡξίωσαν: <i>a</i> in <i>e</i> corr man rec	F 141 B
C	(108) ἀλώπεξι] ἀλώπηξι	*
D	οὔτω. Βοὸξ] οὔτως. Βοὸξ	*
316 B	Μεμφιβοσὲθ] μεμφιβοσθὲ τὴν μὲν] pr καὶ	142 A
C	ἐπάταξεν τὸν Σέρ] ἐπάταξε τὸν σὲφ όνειδίσαντα τῷ Ι.] ὄνειδίσαντα τὸν ί.	* C
D	(109) αὐτοὺς μὲν ἀνήρει] αὐτὸς μὲν ἀνήρει	D
317 A	ταῖς ψυχαῖς] pr ἐν	F
B	ἐπάταξε] ἐπάτασσε τριάκοντα 1°] τριακοσίους τῶ (sign contract male interpretatus est editor)	143 A
	τριάκοντα 2°] τριακοσίων (similis error)	
C	τὸν οἶκον] τὸ τεῖχος	C
D	τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν αὐτῶν] τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν αὐτοῦ βόες δὲ] om δὲ	* D
320 A	δέκα μὲν φυλαὶ] post hoc lacuna (9 litt.)	E
	ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ] om ἐν	F
B	(110) προεφήτευσε] ἐπροφήτευσε	*
C	Βίβλος δ', Βασιλειῶν] om Ἡλισσαῖος] ἐλισσαῖος Σουναμίτιδος] σουμανίτιδος	144 C
D	ἐδιωχθησαν καὶ] + ἀνηρέθησαν Οχοσίου] ὄχοξίου	D E
321 A	Ιωαχάξ] ιωάχας ἐπὶ Ὀσηὲ] ἐπὶ ὠσηὲ	F
	μετὰ ταῦτα ὑψωσεν αὐτὸν τὸν Ιωακεὶμ] καὶ μ. τ. ὑ. αὐτὸν ὁ χιωακεὶμ	
	ἔδωκε αὐτῷ] ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ	*
B	Ἐπιτομὴ πράξεων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰσραὴλ] om	145 A
	Ἰουδαίων] ιοῦ (quod infra ιούδα sine dubio significat)	
	τὰ ὄνόματα] τά τε ὄνόματα	*
	(111) Μετὰ δὲ τὸ] om δὲ	B
C	νιὸς Ωδὴδ] νιὸς [lacuna (3 litt.)] ὠδὴδ	D

- *
 'Αναμῆ] ἀναμῆ
 'Ιωσαφάτ] ἰωσαφάθ
 D ἔτι ὑπῆρχε] ἔτη ὑπῆρχε
 324 A [Ζαχαρίας]] om *
 θυμιάσαι ἐν] θυμιάσαι ἐν 146 A
 Οὐ σοὶ, Ὁξία, θυμιάσαι τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς
 iερεῦσιν] sic marg: txt οὐ σοὶ δξία κώ', θύ'.
 ἀλλ' ἢ τοῖς iερεῦσι
 B προεφήτευσεν] ἐπροφήτευσεν *
 C (112) ἐβασίλευσεν] sic marg: txt om E
 D Εὐφράτου] ἐ in εὐ corr marg F
 'Ωλδὰ] ὄλδὰ
 'Ιωάχαζ] sic marg: txt iάχαζ
 325 A Ναβουχοδονόσωρ] ναβουχοδονόσορ
 μετωνόμασε] μετωνόμασεν 147 A
 Βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ.] om B
 D νιοῦ Ἀδέρ] ιονάδερ E
 328 A (113) οὐκ ἀπέστη γάρ] pr καὶ 148 A
 'Ιοάχαζ] iάχαζ
 C Σαδδουκαῖοι] σαδουκαῖοι D
 329 A ἐν μέρει] ἐκ μέρους *
 τὰ περὶ Ἰεροβοάμ, Σαμαίας καὶ Ἀδδὼ, οἱ προ-
 φῆται] bis scriptum (σαβαίας bis) 149 A
 (114) Ἰηοῦ] ινοῦ
 'Ιούδα καὶ Ἰσραὴλ] sic: ubi tamen (de Amasia)
 Montf. 'Ιούδα Ἰσραὴλ. B
 B 'Ιούδα καὶ Ἰσραὴλ] om καὶ (ter) *
 C διετείνατο] διετείναντο D
 332 A 'Αβίας] σαβίας] sic pr man 150 A
 'Ασωτίους] sic marg: txt ἀξωτίους B
 ἐποίησε] ἐπεισε
 ἐξέβαλε] ἐξέβαλ sic: fors ἐξέβαλον legendum est
 B ἔαντοῦ. Ἰστορεῖται] αὐτοῦ. ἵστορηται C
 C (115) ἴστάναι] ἐστάναι F
 D κινύραις] σκιννύραις (vid)
 333 A ἐν νάβλαις] ἐνάβλαις 151 A

	'Εμφαναίας, καὶ Μακαία] ἐνφαναίας καὶ μα-		
	κανία	B	
	κινύραις] κιννύραις		
B	ρμγ', ρμδ'] pr ρμβ	D	
C	(116) ρδ', κβ'] + κῆ		
	Ψαλμοὶ ὡδῆς, κθ', ξγ'] ψαλμὸς ὡδῆς κθ ξξ.		
	idem sign contract pro ψαλμὸς usurpatur		
	quod supra (ψαλμὸς ὡδῆς δ̄)		
336 A	μήτε τῷ Δαβὶδ] pr μήτε τοῦ δάδ	152 A	
C	κοινοὶ δὲ πάντως] κοινοὶ δὲ πάντων	E	
337 A	(117) ριδ'] + ρτε	153 A	
B	ό ρμβ'] δ̄, ρμβ	B	
	ό ε',] ο̄ε.		*
C	οἱ η'] οἱ η̄		
	τοῖς νιοῖς Κορὲ εἰς σύνεσιν Ὁδὴ] sic marg: txt	C	
	lacuna (8 litt.)	D	
	Βερσαβεέ] βηρσαβεέ		
D	ἐν τῇ φάραγγι τῶν Ἀλῶν] sic marg: txt τὴν	E	
	φάλαγγα τῶν ἀλῶν		
	σῶσαι με Κύριον] σῶσαι με κέ		
	[Ιωναδὰβ]] om: sed in marg scriptum est		
	"alias ιωναδὰβ"		
	ὅτε κατώκισται ἡ γῆ· ξγ'] οἱ ξγ ὅτε κ. ἡ γῆ	F	
	ἔξιθεν] ἔξιθεν		
340 B	(118) τὸ καλούμενον Παροιμίαι] τὸ κ. παροιμίας	154 D	
C	φασιν αὐτῷ] φασὶ αὐτῷ	E	
341 A	όμονοίᾳ] όμονήα (vid)	155 B	
	αιρετικῶν] αἰρέσεων		
344 C	(119) δίκαιοι] in marg "forte δίκαιον"	156 E	
	δοκιμάζῃ] δοκιμάζει	D	
345 A	(120) ἀπατῶντες,] ἀπατῶντε.	157 B	
	αἴσθησιν] sic marg: txt αἴστησιν	C	
	νεῖκος] νῦκος		
B	νεῖκος] νῦκος	D	
	φίλερις] φίλερεις		
D	πτοεῖσθαι] πτοεῖσθε	F	
348 A	πετομένου] πετωμένου	*	
B	(121) ἐκλήθη] ἐκκλήθη	158 C	

	φρόνιμος]	φόνιμος	*
C	γενεθλιαλογίας νόησιν]	γενεθλιαλογίαν πτόησιν	*
	έκάστου]	έκαστων	*
D	συνετοῖς [δυνατοῖς]]	συνετοῖς συνετοῖς	F
349 A	ἐξουσιδσαιτο]	ἐξουσιάσατο	159 A
	ἐπιχήρησις]	ἐπιχείρησις	*
	ἀργεῖν]	ἀρχεῖν: sed corr pr man	B
352 B	(122) ἄλλαι]	αἰλλαι	160 C
C	δεικνύντος]	δεικνύοντος (Montf. δεικνυέντος)	E
	πάντων]	+ τῶν	
D	(123) ἐσωτέραν]	ἐσωτερικὴν (Montf. ἐσωτέρην)	161 A
353 B	ἐξουδενήσουσί με]	ἐξ. μοι	C
D	τοίνυν]	+ ἡ	F
	έταιρων]	έτέρων	162 A
356 A	ἔξελθε]	+ σὺ	
	(124) Σουναμίτιδι]	σουμανίτιδι	*
B	Εἰσάγαγέ]	εἰσαγάγετέ	D
C	ἰσχύσι]	ἰσχύσεσι	*
D	Εἰς κῆπον]	ώς κῆπον	F
	ἐν γεννήματι]	ἐν γενήματι	*
	τοῦ χειμάρρου]	τοῦ χειμάρου	
	Αμιναδάβ]	ἀμιναδάμ	163 A
357 D	(125) Ἀνεμῆ]	ἀνεμί	*
360 A	προεφήτευσαν]	ἐπροφήτευσαν	*
	ἀνάγων αὐτὴν]	ἀ. ἔαυτὴν: sed corr	164 B
B	κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ]	+ καὶ	C
C	(126) προεφήτευσε]	ἐπροφήτευσε	*
361 A	μετενόησαν]	μετανόησαν: sic pr man	165 B
364 A	(127) Ἄμως]	ἀμμώς	166 C
C	προείπομεν]	ποείπωμεν	F
D	(128) Αὐλῆς]	αὐχῆς: sed corr pr man	167 A
368 A	(129) παγγενὲλ]	παγγενὴ	*
B	προσκυνοῦντος αὐτὸν]	προσκυνοῦντάνον (vid)	168 E
	δλορρίζους]	δλοριζους	*
369 C	(130) ἔφραξεν]	ἔφραξαν	170 B
372 A	'Ασσύριοι]	ἀσύριοι	D
B	ἐν τῇ αἰχμ.]	ἐτῇ αἰχμ.: ν supra τ e man rec	E
	κοιμᾶσθαι]	κοιμᾶσθε	F

C	(131) Τίγριν] τίγρην	*
D	[τούτου]] om	*
373 A	τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ] om τα	*
	πενθεροὺς] πενθερεῖς (vid)	171 E
B	Βιβλίον Σοφίας] β. σοφία	*
C	περὶ τῷ] ἐπὶ τῷ μέλει] μέλλει	172 B
D	(132) παράθεσις] παράθεσιν	D
376 A	ἐπέμφθη] ἐπέφθη Μωϋσέως] μωσέως	E
B	κατεσκευασμένων] κατασκ.	*
C	γεννημάτων] γενημάτων	*
D	κιθαρίζοντι] κιθαρίζωντι	D
	(133) Ἰησοῦς οὗτος] Ἰησοῦς οὗτος	
377 A	καθά] + καὶ ό α' Ἰησοῦσ] ὁ ἀ νιὸς φέρητο] ὄχητο	E
B	ἔπειτα] + περὶ φόβου κύ· εἰτα	174 A
D	κτημάτων] κτήτων	D
380 C	(134) φωράσεως] φοράσεως	*
D	πλημμελείας] πλημμελίας	*
381 D	(135) ἐπειράσθησαν] ἐπειράθησαν	*
384 A	Μωϋσέως] μωσέως ἐθαυματούργει] ἐθαυματούργη	*
B	σχισματοποιῶν] σχημ.: sed marg "forte σχισμ."	176 E
C	ἐνδόξοις] + ὅτι ἴωσήφ ἐν τοῖς ἐνδόξοις	*
D	(136) παρεδόθη] παρεδόθει συντελεῖας] pr τῆς	E
385 A	ό παῖς] + τοῦ Ναζαρὲθ] ναζαρὲτ	F
C	κωφὸς] κοφὸς	*
D	ό ὄχλος] om ο	C
	Νινευῖται] νινευῖτε	D
388 A	(137) πέμπει] πέμπη	F
C	τὸ δίδραχμα] τὰ διδράγματα ἐκατὸν] ρ	*
D	Εἴτα 1°] + ἡ	179 C
389 A	τὸν ὄνον] τὴν ὄνον	D

B	ἐρωτᾶς αὐτοὺς] ἐ. αὐτοῖς	F
(138)	μελλόντων] pr τῶν	*
C	[ἔχουσα]] om	*
C	ἄγωμεν] ἄγομεν	180 B
	ἡγαγον] + τὸν	
	ἔκριναν] ἔκρινον	
D	Εὐαγγέλιον] om	*
	Ναζαρὲθ] ναζαρὲτ	*
392 A	[ἔχοντα]] om	*
B	μογιλάλον] μογγιλάλον: sed corr	*
C	πρωτείων] προτείων: sed corr man rec	181 B
395 B	(139) Προσεύχεται] sic marg: txt -ετε	F
	συλλαμβάνεται] sic marg: txt -ετε	
C	κρημνίσαι] κρημνήσαι	*
D	χεῖρα] χεῖραν	182 C
396 B	(140) καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν] καθ' ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ	F
	ἡμῶν	
D	Τμεῖς τὸ] ἡμεῖς τὸ: sed corr in marg	183 C
397 A	ἀποκτεινόντων] ἀποκτενώντων (Montf. ἀπο-	D
	κτενόντων)	
B	(141) πρωτοκλισίας] πρωτοκλησίας	F
D	ἀγοράσαι] ἀγοράσε ἑαυτῷ	184 C
400 A	μετὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων] τοῖς ἰουδαίοις	D
	βαλάντιον] βαλλάντιον	E
	τύπτεται] τύπτετο	
B	ἡπίστουν] ἡπιστους: sed corr man rec	F
C	τὸν Φίλιππον ὁ Ἄνδρεας πρὸς αὐτὸν. Τῇ	
	ἐπαύριον καλεῖ] om	185 A
401 A	(142) οἱ μαθῆται] εἰς μαθῆται	D
B	Σαμαρείτης] σαμαρίτις	F
C	ἀμφέβαλον] ἡμφέβαλον	*
404 A	(143) Κλεοπᾶ] κλοπᾶ	186 E
B	λύτρα ἔκατόν.] λύτρα	
C	ε', Πράξεις] ἐ· πράξις	187 A
D	συγκατηριθμ.] συγκαταριθμ.	C
405 B	(144) Πύθονος] πύθωνος	*
	ἐκαθάρισε] ἐκαθέρισε	188 A
C	προσδοκώντων] προσδοκόντων	B

D	έπτά· τούτων πρώτη] ξ̄: τούτων ἀ̄,	*
408 A	παραγγέλλει (bis)] παραγγέλει	D, E
B	γενομένοις] γενημένοις	F
C	οἱ ἀποθανόντες] οἱ προ ἀποθανόντες	189 A
	διαμένωσι] sic marg: txt διαμένω	
D	(145) παραγγέλλει (bis)] παραγγέλει	C, D
409 B	οὕτως καὶ ἐν] οὕτω καὶ ἐν	*
	ἀπαύγασμα] pr ως	F
C	εὔχεσθαι] + ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτανόντων καὶ περὶ	
	ποίας οὐ δεῖ εὔχεσθαι	190 B
D	(146) κόσμου] pr τοῦ	*
412 C	παραγγέλλει] παραγγέλει	191 B
D	βιβλίον ξ̄] βιβλίον ξ̄	*
	(147) τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων] τὸν ἐντ.: corr marg	E
413 B	ἐλέγχει καὶ συγκλείει] συγκλείει καὶ ἐλέγχει	192 B
	ό γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ] ὁ γὰρ ἀβραμ	C
D	καλῆται] καλέται	D
	Τίοῦ] + τοῦ θῦ	*
416 A	γίνεσθε] γίνεσθαι	193 A
B	(148) εἰδωλείοις] εἰδώλοις	C
	ἀδιαφόρων] sic marg: txt διαφόρων	
C	ἔγραψαν] sic marg: txt ἔγραψεν	D
	πολιτεύωνται] sic marg: txt -ωντε	E
	εἰδωλίω] εἰδωλείω	*
D	παραγγέλλει] παραγγέλει	F
417 A	ἀντιγράφει] ἀντιγράφη	194 B
B	(149) καινὴ] κενὴ	C
D	παραγγέλλει] παραγγέλει	F
420 A	καταβολῆς] pr πρὸ	195 A
C	(150) ἀπελογήσατο] sic marg: txt -αντο	E
	ἡγοῦμαι] ἡγημαι	
D	ἀποστέλλει] ἐπι- corr in ἀπο- pr man	F
421 B	μέντοι αὐτοὺς] -οὺς corr in -οῖς pr man	196 C
424 A	(151) ἀδικούντων] pr αὐτοὺς	197 C
B	Ἀντίχριστος] ἀντίχρηστος	
	ὑπενξάμενος] ἐπενξάμενος	*
D	αἴματος 1°] sic marg: txt αἴμενος	198 A
425 A	(152) ἐπεχείρουν] ἐπεχείρουσ	C
B	ἐπιτιμᾶν] sic marg: txt ἐπιμιμᾶν	D

	<i>μανθάνειν ἥ]</i> sic marg : txt μ. καὶ <i>τὰς νεωτέρας]</i> sic marg : txt τούς νεωτέρους (vid)	E
D	<i>παραγγέλλει]</i> παραγγέλει	199 B
428 A	(153) <i>οὕτω]</i> οὕτως	*
B	<i>ὑποτάσσεσθαι]</i> ὑποτάσσεσθαι	F
429 A	<i>ἡρμηνεύθησαν]</i> ἐρμηνεύθησαν	200 C
	<i>σφραγίδας]</i> pr ἐπτά	*
B	(154) <i>όξν]</i> ὀξὺν	F
C	<i>βάλλοντα]</i> βάλλοντα	*
	<i>κλείοντα]</i> κλίνοντα	201 B
432 A	<i>Συράχ]</i> σηράχ	E
B	<i>'Εζεχιὴλ]</i> ἵζεκιὴλ	F
C	(155) <i>πάντως]</i> πάντα (πᾶν sic)	202 B
	<i>'Ιεζεχιὴλ]</i> ιεζεκιὴλ	C
D	<i>ἡρμηνεύθη]</i> ἐρμηνεύθη	D
433 A	<i>Πράξεις]</i> pr τὰς	*
436 A	(156) <i>Κομμόδου]</i> κομόδου	*
B	<i>'Ακτιον]</i> ἀρκτίοις	203 E
C	Tίνα <i>ἐστι]</i> pr (minio script) <i>'Ιωσήπου</i> ἐκ τοῦ ὑπομνηστικοῦ. κε'. <u>ρητῆ</u>	204 B
	ταῖς γραφαῖς] τῇ γραφῇ	
	<i>Σιλωνίτου]</i> σηλωνίτου	
	<i>Παραλειπομ.]</i> παραλιπομ. (et sic infra).	C
437 A	<i>Σολομῶντος]</i> pr τοῦ <i>ἐπιγέγραπται]</i> + ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡδαί ἥσαν τῷ σολο- μῶντι πεντακισχιλίαιν καὶ ἐλάλησε περὶ τῶν ξύλων ἀπὸ τῆς κέδρου τῆς ἐν τῷ λι- βάνῳ· καὶ ἔως τῆς ὑσώπου τῆς ἐκπορευο- μένης διὰ τοῦ τοίχου· καὶ ἐλάλησε περὶ τῶν κτηνῶν· καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν· καὶ τῶν ἐρπετῶν· καὶ τῶν ἴχθύων· καὶ ταῦτα νῦν οὐδαμοῦ ἐν ἐβραικοῖς συγγράμμασιν εὑρίσκονται.	D
	<i>γεγράφθαι]</i> γεγραφέναι	
	<i>ἐπιγινώσκομεν]</i> pr ἡμεῖς	
	<i>εὑρίσκεσθαι]</i> εὑρισκόμενον. πρόδηλον οὖν ὅτι ταῦτα πάντα ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀσεβῶν ιουδαίων ἀπονοίας καὶ ἀμελείας ἀπώλοντο. Sequitur titulus minio script: δωροθέου κ.τ.λ.	

TEXTS AND STUDIES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO
BIBLICAL AND PATRISTIC LITERATURE

EDITED BY

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON B.D.

HON. PH.D. GÖTTINGEN HON. D.D. HALLE
NORRISIAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY

VOL. III.

THE RULES OF TYCONIUS
THE FOURTH BOOK OF EZRA
EUTHALIANA

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1895

F. W. Faber
Antiquarier
Frankfurt

The following are now published:

- Vol. I. No. 1. THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES: by J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A.: with an Appendix by THE EDITOR. Second Edition. 5s. net.
- No. 2. THE PASSION OF S. PERPETUA, with an Appendix on the Scillitan Martyrdom: by THE EDITOR. 4s. net.
- No. 3. THE LORD'S PRAYER IN THE EARLY CHURCH: by F. H. CHASE, D.D. 5s. net.
- No. 4. THE FRAGMENTS OF HERACLEON: by A. E. BROOKE, M.A. 4s. net.
- Vol. II. No. 1. A STUDY OF CODEX BEZAE: by J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A. 7s. 6d. net.
- No. 2. THE TESTAMENT OF ABRAHAM: by M. R. JAMES, Litt.D., with an Appendix by W. E. BARNES, B.D. 5s. net.
- No. 3. APOCRYPHA ANECDOTA: containing thirteen unpublished apocryphal books and fragments: by M. R. JAMES, Litt.D. 6s. net.
- Vol. III. No. 1. THE RULES OF TYCONIUS: by F. C. BURKITT, M.A. 5s. net.
- No. 2. THE FOURTH BOOK OF EZRA: the Latin Version edited from the MSS by the late Professor BENSLEY: with an Introduction by M. R. JAMES, Litt.D. 5s. net.
- No. 3. EUTHALIANA: Studies of Euthalius, Codex H Paul and the Armenian Version: by THE EDITOR. 4s. net.

A separate title page for binding is issued with the last number of each volume.

The following are in course of preparation:

THE ATHANASIAN CREED AND ITS EARLY COMMENTARIES. By A. E. BURN, M.A.

COPTIC APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS: Translations, together with the Texts of some of them: by FORBES ROBINSON, M.A.

THE CURETONIAN SYRIAC GOSPELS: re-edited together with the readings of the Sinaitic Codex and a translation into English: by F. C. BURKITT, M.A.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *QVIS DIVES SALVETVR*: re-edited, together with an examination of Clement's Text of the Gospels and Acts: by P. M. BARNARD, M.A.

APOCRYPHA ANECDOTA: Second Series: by M. R. JAMES, Litt.D.

PALLADIUS, HISTORIA LAUSIACA: a critical discussion of the documents, together with various notes on early monachism in Egypt: by E. C. BUTLER, O.S.B.

19337

BR

45

T43

v.3

no.3

Robinson, Joseph Armitage, 1858-1933.

Euthaliana; studies of Euthalius, codex H of the Pauline epistles, and the Armenian version; with an appendix containing a collation of the Eton ms. of the pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis, by J. Armitage Robinson ... Cambridge [Eng.] The University press, 1895.

x, 120 p. 22^{1/2}. (Added t.-p.: Texts and studies; contributions to Biblical and patristic literature. Vol. III, no. 3)

CONTENTS.—Recent contributions to the discussion of the Euthalian problem.—The work done by Euthalius.—The date of Euthalius, and traces of his influence.—Notes on codex H of the Pauline epistles.—The Armenian version and its supposed relation to Euthalius.—Summary of results.—Appendix: Collation of the pseudo-Athanasian Synopsis.

19337

